

LEVEL  
ONE

# Christian Order

Summary of

Property of  
Graduate Theological Union  
JUL 24 1986

WHERE ARE THE SAINTS?

THE EXTRAORDINARY

FRANCIS CARDINAL

MORALS AND MONEY

STATEMENT ON MATTERS OF CONCERN

TO MANY CATHOLICS

CLAVIER HOUSE : FOR THE RECORD : 2

*Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice*

*Paul Crane, S.J.*

## READERS

are reminded that *Christian Order* will not be published in July and August. The next issue to be published will be the August/September number, which will appear at the beginning of September.

*Cum Permissu Superiorum*

## Contents

### Page

- 322 THE ESSENTIAL TASK  
*The Editor*
- 324 ON THE RIGHT TRACK ?  
*W. M. Quirk*
- 331 MORALS AND MONEY IN CHINA  
*China News Analysis*
- 343 STATEMENT ON MATTERS OF CONCERN TO MANY CATHOLICS  
*Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice*
- 346 THE EXTRAORDINARY SYNOD: 4  
*Philip Trower*
- 356 WHERE ARE THE SAINTS?  
*Fr. Bryan Houghton*
- 361 ANALYSIS OF LIBERATION THEOLOGY  
*Fr. Thomas O'Mahony*
- 369 CLAVER HOUSE: FOR THE RECORD: 2  
*Paul Crane, S.J.*
- 375 FRANCIS CARDINAL BOURNE  
*R. S.*

*Christian Order* is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

*Christian Order* is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £5 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$10.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows:

U.S.A., Canada

India, etc.—£10, \$20

Australia—£12, \$25

New Zealand—£12, \$25

### If You Change Your Address:

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

# Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

---

VOLUME 27

JUNE/JULY

NO. 6/7

---

## The Essential Task

THE EDITOR

WHAT worries me a great deal these days is not merely what is being communicated by way of Religious Instruction, particularly to the young; but what is best described as the increasing inability, both moral and physical, of well-disposed priests and religious to communicate at all. I have dealt, as have others, in the pages of *Christian Order*, with what is communicated. What concerns me in this Editorial is the ability to communicate.

This is at a marked and grave discount. And why? Because the number of priests and religious able physically to communicate the riches of the Faith to others is growing proportionately less all the time. There are two reasons for this. One is that, given the neo-modernist and semi-secularized professors and lecturers found today in too many seminaries and houses of study of religious orders and congregations in this and other countries of the West, those who emerge from their clutches as supposedly qualified priests and religious have in fact very little knowledge of the true doctrinal and moral teaching of the Catholic Church. The tiny few who emerge unscathed from this ordeal to which the majority succumb are outweighed inevitably by those who — mostly through no fault of their own — have been transformed by their professors into incipient neo-Modernists. And, further, when this tiny minority goes into the pastoral field, so to say, its members will find themselves confronted everywhere with a heavily increased — and increasing — number of young



Catholics, whose Faith has been eroded in the class-room and at Catechetical Centres in the same way that it has been fuzzed into neo-Modernism far too often in the seminary or house of formation and studies for religious. In consequence, the priest or religious who is true to his or her Catholic Faith is bound to find himself more and more overworked as the number of those who think rightly and truly, as they themselves do, declines proportionately over and against those whom we can term — again and, as a rule, through no fault of their own — neo-Modernist dissidents. At the same time, the proportion of young Catholics who come out of school with little or no real knowledge of their Faith, will be steadily increasing. Under such circumstances, communication of the Faith to others will become for your good priest or religious a virtually impossible task. And it may well be rendered not only virtually, but absolutely impossible if — as is not all that unlikely — a dissident clerical and religious majority were to hound a faithful and shrinking minority out of the pastoral and teaching fields.

This, as I see it, is the problem that confronts the Church. I do not see that anything is to be gained by closing our eyes to it. This will not make the problem go. It will serve only to let it grow. What has to be realised is that the seminary and house of formation and study for religious (seminary will stand for both for the remainder of this Editorial) must be subjected, not merely to cosmetic dabbing; but to a thorough doctrinal and moral scrubbing, if the Catholic Church, as we know it, is to survive. Nothing less will do. The question, then, is twofold; has the Church the men to do this job and has the Holy Father the strength over and against Bishops and Religious Superiors to see that those able and willing in every respect to take charge of seminaries and cleanse them, will be put in a position to do so?

If a positive answer can be given to this twofold question, then it seems to me that the Holy Father, without delay, must bring to heel the seminaries and houses of religious formation even if, to do so effectively, he will have to dismiss and if necessary, excommunicate those who would block the way to this essential cleansing.

Comparison with the twenty years that followed the Council of Trent does not redound to the credit of the twenty that have followed the Second Vatican Council. The Author notes at the conclusion of his perceptive piece that the Synod Report is stressing the need for what Catholic parents have been calling for during the past twenty years; calls that have been disregarded for the most part by local ecclesiastical authorities.

## On the Right Track?

W. M. QUIRK

READERS may have become aware of the programme of discussions on the nature and purpose of the Church held in Lent 1986 and preceded by the publication of a booklet bearing the title *What on Earth is the Church for?* Issued jointly by the Catholic Truth Society and the British Council of Churches, the booklet poses a number of points for discussion with a lengthy commentary in which a range of possible conclusions is reviewed. Catholics may well have found much which was worthy of discussion but, to the fundamental questions, there are naturally correct answers and it would be unfortunate if Catholics taking part ended up either giving or receiving the impression that it was proper to seek a consensus.

It is not flippant to reflect that instruction on what the Church is for would have been a valuable preparation for all laypeople who took part in the discussions preparatory to the Extraordinary Synod. In the final analysis, the purpose of the Church is no more and no less than to lead us all to save our souls. All else is subsidiary. The Council, which described itself as pastoral and had no doctrinal or disciplinary decrees to promulgate, can have had no other basic purpose while the Synod, called to evaluate implementation of the Council, was serving the same purpose. After the conclusion of the Synod, the

*Catholic Herald* headline read "Synod decides Church is on the right track". That sort of headline was perhaps to be expected even if the conclusion was not. Readers of *Christian Order* will, for the most part, think that in many ways the Church is not on the right track, but there are others who, for very different reasons, think that the Council has sunk without trace. They, too, would not agree with that headline.

### *A Useful Corrective*

If we are inclined to think that it is too soon, after a mere twenty years, to make a judgement on that, consideration of the position twenty years after Trent, an era in which communications were little better than in apostolic times, will apply a useful corrective. By 1583, there were signs of renewal in every direction. The Council's doctrinal decrees had been followed within about three years by the issue of the celebrated *Catechism* which set forth with great precision what Catholics were required to believe and the moral principles they had to follow. In matters of discipline, too, there had been striking progress. Cardinals and bishops were first to feel the change. In Rome, austerity took over from ostentatious good living, the accumulation of wealth and scandalous behaviour as St. Pius V, by his own example and the appointment of men of outstanding virtue, led the way. Bishops were required to reside in their dioceses, thus effectively abolishing pluralities, and apply the reforms there. The parish clergy were taken to task where necessary. The liturgy was conducted with dignity and solemnity; the laity were trained to behave themselves fittingly in church; the Mass obligation was introduced and frequent reception of the Sacraments encouraged. Seminaries were set up for the training of priests and, of course, a revised Missal and Breviary had been brought into use. This outline of what took place within twenty years of Trent is well known. The renewal of spiritual life and of the public face of the Church together inaugurated four centuries of growth. A tree is known by its fruits; Trent must surely reckon as the greatest event in the history of the Church. How, then, do we measure up today against that notable yardstick?



## *The Way, the Truth and the Life*

We have said that the Church's objective must be to lead mankind to salvation. In the inevitable absence of salvation statistics, we have a problem which can be assessed only by going to basic principles. The Church fulfills her purpose simply by being true to her own nature as the mystical body of Christ. "I am the way, and the truth and the life" says Our Lord and by extension the Church, his visible presence on earth, must also be, and be seen to be, in the activity of her members, the way, the truth and the life.

When we remember the worldly and dissolute prelates and clergy who abounded before Trent, we can see that, though the Church never ceased to be the way, very often it will not have been obvious. While that particular problem is no longer with us today, thanks initially to Trent, we may wonder in what sense the Church does appear to be unmistakeably the way. Certainly not in relation to sexual morality. Surveys tell us that Catholics are not notably different from their fellow-citizens in such matters as divorce, pre-marital relations, contraception. The most widely known publications and courses of religious instruction are not renowned for their adherence to the highest ideals, or even the minimum requirements of Catholic teaching. In an area which is probably the most debilitating for Catholic life in the West, the Church is seen to be keeping a low profile, rather timorous of teaching out loud. The Pope does so teach but, in the media, is usually presented as someone who merely disapproves of modern morality and who, because of his age and nationality, is out of touch with the modern outlook.

In St. Paul's striking phrase, the Church is the pillar and mainstay of truth and, following her Master, must be seen to be so. The world may not accept what it says but it should at least be able to recognise that it does not teach with an uncertain or contradictory voice. It is notorious that modern theology has increasingly indulged in dissent and derogation from doctrine so that from published works, from seminary training, from institutes of education, from the schools, there arises a half-baked mish-mash under the guise of Catholic truth. Others having a direct acquaint-



anceship with these sources have often given chapter and verse. I will turn to a rather different aspect.

### *Imprecision and Fudging of Doctrine*

Reading through the Bishops' Response to the final report of ARCIC 1, I came across the statement: "We do not insist on the language of transubstantiation". Leaving aside that, only a couple of decades ago in *Mysterium Fidei*, Paul VI did insist on such language and, in doing so, followed the Council of Trent and, before that, the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, one immediately wonders whether it is merely the language which is at risk, together perhaps with the "theological/philosophical attempts to explain it". These are in the end expendable if something more satisfactory can take their place. What is not expendable is the meaning of the doctrine and, given that doctrine is in the end for the benefit of ordinary men and women without benefit of theological training, it is a little surprising that the documents in the case have never contained the teaching in the plain but unambiguous language in which it has to be conveyed to the man in the pew. Beginning, for example, "Catholics know that they have to dis-believe the evidence of their senses. This is not bread; that is not wine".

Further in the same response, we read that "reservation for Catholics is a sign of Christ's abiding presence in the Church and a much loved focus of devotion". True, but if we leave it at that, we are not far from Luther for whom the sacramental signs were mere symbols exciting to faith. The full truth is that for Catholics reservation and adoration is a natural, even necessary, consequence of accepting the unchangeable teaching of the Church. If we do not accept the connection, it is because we do not accept the teaching.

What are we to make of this? Not heresy, as some have suggested, but something which is perhaps more pervasive these days and more difficult to deal with. A general impatience with insistence on precision in doctrine; a willingness to accept without consciously compromising one's own beliefs some fudge in presentation for the sake of a greater good — in this case, church unity. Unfortunately for that outlook, the Church is firmly embedded in the solid rock

of truth. Excavations to introduce some palatable fudge are liable to weaken the faith of its members and obscure its image as the pillar and mainstay of truth. They will not be allowed to continue indefinitely.

The Church, like Our Lord, is also 'the life'. It is through the Church that, until the end of time, mankind will share in the life of the Most Holy Trinity. The only comment to make here is that, in our own country, as in many others for twenty years past, fewer and fewer have felt encouraged to share that life. What price evangelisation when Catholics are melting away in their thousands.

Of course, some will quote features to show a brighter picture, and it may well be that behind the Iron Curtain, in Africa and in Asia, a different picture altogether would emerge. Nevertheless, what I have written above exemplifies the reason why readers of *Christian Order* would agree that the Church is not on the right track.

### *The Synod Report*

But did, in fact, the Synod say that it was? One never, of course, expects the authorities in the Church to indulge in denigration of their predecessors' policies as is the way with politicians. So it was not really to be expected that the Holy Father would lead the bishops at the Synod into some sweeping condemnation of post-Vatican II policies. Another characteristic of clerics and religious at all levels is that they do not admit publicly the possibility that they might have made mistakes. Bearing that in mind while reading the final report of the Synod, we can see that it is a remarkable document.

### *Rome the Authentic Teacher*

It starts, as might be expected, with a reference to the great benefits of the Council and the warm welcome from by far the majority of the faithful, but this is followed almost immediately by an acknowledgement that in the "first world", despite the abounding benefits of the Council and extensive and deep teaching about the Church, there often appears to be dis-affection towards the Church. There were clearly representatives, both of those who see no cause for concern and those who have put aside their rose tinted spectacles. As we read on, it is evident that the initial

expression of 'celebration' in the report quickly gives way to analysis of the reasons for widespread failure. Thus, we are told that notable causes of difficulty are the partial and selective reading of the Council and the superficial interpretation of its teaching; that, for accurate understanding of the Council, the Apostolic Exhortations resulting from the Synods held from 1969 should be applied. Translated into blunter terms, this means: Rome is the authentic teacher; forget all the self-appointed experts who have tried to impose their own interpretations.

In perhaps the most important statement of the document, we are told to understand how the Council is in continuity with the great tradition of the Church. "The Church is one and the same in all Councils". It follows, therefore, that because the time is now ripe, as it was not after Trent, to attempt to reconcile the heretic, we must not in doing so cease to correct his errors. Because, at times in the past, we may have failed to make known the richness and fruitfulness of the truth of Christ and concentrated on apologetics, we are not allowed, in rectifying that failure, to treat with disdain the definitions which will safeguard for all time the true meaning of the faith once delivered to the apostles. While we try to make something of modern descriptions of the Church like 'People of God' etc, (all flowing from Pius XII's noble teaching on the Mystical Body), we are not allowed to reject the essential hierarchical element which includes, for example, the Supremacy of the Pope or the sacerdotal character conferred by Orders.

There is a long paragraph of suggestions on formation in seminaries and religious houses, the inclusion of which is comprehensible only in the knowledge that practice has widely departed from the ideals mentioned.

### *Endorsement of What Parents Have Called For*

Probably the most trenchant criticism in the report can be found under the heading Evangelization. "Everywhere in the world today the transmission of the faith and of the moral values derived from the Gospel to the next generation is endangered. Knowledge of the faith and recognition of a moral order are often reduced to a minimum. A new effort is required. . . ." But is not this just what parents have been pressing on their bishops for the past twenty



years and receiving little thanks for their pains. Yes, a new effort is required and new men and women to make it. As the Synod says: "We badly need saints today".

Though the liturgical renewal receives a formal commendation, we are told in the same paragraph that active participation consists first of all in interior and spiritual participation. "The liturgy, if anything, must nourish and illumine the sense of the sacred. It should be filled with the spirit of reverence, of giving worship and glory to God". Comment is superfluous.

There is much more in similar vein. Nearly every section contains comments or recommendations which to traditional Catholics will seem blindingly obvious. The unspoken thread running through it all is: 'This is what we were required to do twenty years ago; we have not made much of a fist of it'. How many of the Fathers understood it that way as they went along is an interesting question on which light will doubtless be shed in the course of time. Pope John Paul, as shown by his apparently unhesitating acceptance of the report, clearly accepts the message of the Synod which is so much in tune with the tenor of his own preaching.

By us on the outside, the report will be read as a damning indictment of twenty years in which, by word and act, unrelenting efforts have been made to establish the idea of a "Conciliar Church" having only a tenuous connection with the Church of previous Councils.

---

The Editor regrets that once again, pressure on available space has forced him to hold over book reviews planned for this issue.

Since the overthrow of the late Chairman Mao's wife and her three "leftist" associates, "the Gang of Four", the new rulers of China have been trying to modernize the economic system and to reintroduce the profit motive. In the following pages, we reprint from *China News Analysis*, February 1, 1985, a study of the progress of the campaign as it is reported by the Chinese press and radio. There are problems! Acknowledgements and thanks to our Australian contemporary *Social Survey*.

# Morals and Money in China

CHINA NEWS ANALYSIS

THE latest slogan from Peking, "Get Rich!", continues to echo across China to every corner of the land. Easy enough to say, it is not so easy to achieve. Yet the Chinese authorities are being quite consistent in their drive to transform the country's economic framework precisely to allow the people to become prosperous, to purchase consumer goods and to enjoy leisure activities — in short, to do all those things that not so long ago, would have been classified as decadent bourgeois luxury.

## *Promoting the Development of Consumers*

Poverty itself is not a Marxist value; and endurance in times of revolution is just a necessary part of a struggle which must be fought for the ultimate well-being of the working masses. Nonetheless, opening the door to consumerism but thinly veils the economic calculations behind a policy which is something of a wager. Consumption which is carefully maintained and guided will enable China to make up for her economically slow start.

But what about those who cannot keep up the pace? And those to whom "equal opportunities" means nothing since they were never in the running? As the new policy

is implemented, both Party and government are becoming increasingly aware of their responsibilities to all citizens, including the poor and the handicapped of every description. Besides the technical factors which this policy involves, there are others which cannot be quantified in economic terms and which are a reminder of the need to reflect on the quality of human life.

It is not an overstatement to say that China's peasants are still looked down upon by their city-bred compatriots. Awkward, unsophisticated and often uneducated, they smack of the farm and smell of the dungheap. Their skin has been roughened by the sun and fresh air, their clothes also are so poor as to make them instantly conspicuous when they venture into town.

### *City Comforts*

Anyone who has tasted the comforts of city life, however modest, dreads the prospect of being sent to a country village. Here, more often than not, only limited supplies of electricity and running water can be expected. The simple life is more often a virtue of necessity than of choice. But now it is time for the peasants to even the score. Not all of them, of course, for there are still some isolated backwaters whose inhabitants will remain poor for a long time to come. However, villages with energetic ruling teams and, no doubt, enjoying more favourable economic conditions are developing rapidly, and obviously getting results. The press has mentioned peasants buying aeroplanes for their agricultural needs! The use of motorized vehicles, especially motorbikes, is becoming more common. Radios and watches have become so widespread that statistics about them are useless as a measure of the standard of living. Above all, the bright smiles on the faces of the young peasants seen in press photographs, resplendent in jacket and tie, show that the life in the country is not so bad after all. Hard work now brings rewards, and everyone has the right to enjoy the good things of life (*Fortnightly Talks*, 1984, No 20, and *Liaoning Daly*, September 3, 1984).

### *Enjoyment is a Duty*

Enjoyment is a right, but it is also a duty. Gone are the



days when false economies were encouraged by the propagandists and imposed by the planners. Then, according to the Chinese saying, a garment was "new for three years, old for three years and patched for three more". China preferred to accumulate funds for investment in large-scale industrial projects. Belt-tightening and sober living were the order of the day. In any case, people had little money in their pockets, and the state of the shop shelves did not encourage spending. The consumer industry could not develop, for there were neither supplies to offer nor demands to be met. An error, say Chinese leaders and economists now. Money makes money. Consumption not only fulfils man's legitimate desires, but also acts as a catalyst of sound economic development. The peasant masses are now, and will remain for a long time, the largest sector of the population. It is thus logical to concentrate on developing this potential market. The city market, long favoured by the planners, will itself become sounder and stronger (*People's Daily*, October 12, 1984).

The meaning of governmental policy in everyday life is seen in consumption. With a paternal nod, the authorities are encouraging spending. However, although they allow the individual more money in his pocket, it is not meant to stay there. It would be useless.

But the habit of hoarding is hard to break. The young are much more amenable to the call to enjoy life more fully. The old are suspicious and hesitate before parting with their hard-earned cash. They prefer to hoard against leaner years to come. Furthermore, traditionally, the peasant family aimed at self-sufficiency. As many articles for daily use as possible were produced within the family or small work unit. The women would make the shoes out of old pieces of cloth, while the men made furniture with wood picked up here and there. Hence, shoemakers and carpenters were superfluous, and merchants to bridge the gap between consumers and producers even more so.

### *Services*

Under this system of self-sufficiency, agricultural production is the only work that brings in cash. Yet the soil does not need so many hands. It is imperative that country

occupations should be diversified, to keep the peasants in their villages and towns and away from the already overpopulated cities. If consumption were to become a habit, it would bring new jobs in its wake. The manufacture of goods for sale would have to come first, followed by the various services: sales, after-sales, and so on. The businesses being set up in the towns and townships are mainly to keep people where they are. In time, these people will also demand the development of leisure facilities.

In order to make the Chinese spend, the government has decided to make more money available to them. Factory workers are being given bigger bonuses and peasants are receiving higher payments for their produce. By these incentives, the government hopes to encourage people to work harder, thus increasing their spending power.

### *Inequality Legitimate*

The current economic situation in China does not yet allow for the distribution of wealth according to need. On the contrary, unequal work and variable salaries are the rule. Policy is based on the principle of "to each according to his work". Hence, it is considered fair that some should get rich much more quickly than others. Today's privileged include peasants and industrious workers, researchers with brilliant ideas, even entire populations in favoured regions. The government maintains that it is a matter of some becoming wealthy before others and takes pains to reaffirm that the class system cannot resurface.

Capitalism, it says, relies on the exploitation of one social group by another. Under a socialist regime, no one is permitted to exploit another. Differences in wealth can only be quantitative, and the state undertakes to control carefully economic relationships between citizens. Nonetheless, in practice, differences in income can be so great that the quantitative difference becomes qualitative. No great consequences ensue from the purchase of a new suit, but the acquisition of a new tractor or the employment of a domestic helper are rather different. Energies are then released that can be rechannelled into other productive activities which, in turn, generate even greater wealth.

The State still coordinates the economy and the redistribution of wealth by means of a policy, still in its infancy, of taxes and prices. Despite a genuine desire to take into account the real value of goods and the fluctuations of the market, it can, when it so chooses, still intervene to favour one sector of the economy or another.

### *Centralized Planning*

However, it has categorically stated that it no longer wants to centralize planning. Nevertheless, it must remain on the alert to control inflation which, the Chinese must expect, though not for long, and to forestall the excesses of some bold entrepreneurs who take advantage of the liberal trend to inflate their profit margins grossly. Furthermore, it must be vigilant in preventing the formation of cliques and closed shops. These groups try to impede the development of "individual businesses" in many different ways. They create petty administrative problems, make it difficult to obtain raw materials and refuse to allow the use of existing trading channels etc. Some Party members and local officials have been quick to take advantage of the new economic policy and want to keep dangerous competitors out of the game (*People's Daily*, January 19, 1985).

The money accumulated by individuals and families with the government's blessing will, naturally, be poured back into the market if the quality of the goods and services offered is attractive enough. The concept of marketing has now emerged, and Guangdong Province Trading Office has researched the spending behaviour of its population according to age. Taking the 1983 census for its figures, 35.7% of the population is under 16 years of age, 28.8% between 16 and 30, 20.7% between 31 and 50, and 14.8% is over 50. Each group spends differently. The youngest group influence their parents by their love of the attractive and the new, but it is the parents who decide and they take price into consideration. Once financially independent, the young people start by buying what they fancy, and only begin to calculate when marriage and a family enter into the equation. Older people are less concerned with outward appearances and are more interested in comfort and durability. The report concludes that manu-



facturers must consider these factors if they are to be competitive in a free market. Marketing is not just an empty trick, but a science which helps to keep money flowing.

### *Competition*

City workers, farmers, shopkeepers, all are both allowed to get rich and vigorously encouraged to become competitive, not that they may eliminate others, but that they themselves may enjoy the fruits of their labour. Yet many Chinese cannot help wondering. Is this not one of those periods of liberalism which precede harsher times to come? *Nouveaux riches* will be punished tomorrow for the sins of today. And, above all, is the policy in harmony with the ideal of a socialist society? Only yesterday, they were fighting the landlords, yet today they are encouraging the emergence of a new bourgeoisie . . . Nonetheless, the government seems determined to soldier on, applying corrective touches where necessary to allay any negative social consequences of its new economic measures.

Why are there so many speeches about Marxism and socialism Chinese-style? If it is necessary to explain at such length the good "communist" sense of the current reforms, it is doubtless because, for many, this is not apparent. Whatever the authorities say, it is by no means certain that the masses want such policies, or that the majority is, in fact, happy with them. To be sure, daily life seems to have improved, but how many cannot keep up with the new forced pace and fear that they will end up poorer than ever, while their neighbours enjoy an increasingly comfortable existence?

It would be erroneous to believe that absolute equality reigned in the revolutionary bases in the days of the heroic past. The leaders did, in fact, enjoy privileges denied to the ordinary troops. But the life was tough for everyone, and the ideal of sharing, required in part because of the very real poverty and combat conditions, buoyed spirits. The war of arms and ideas had to be won.

### *From the Mountains and the Gorges to the Cities*

In communist parlance, the Nationalists were not only armed men, but also corrupt exploiters. The communists'

aim was to put the country back on its feet and restore the people's confidence. But, in 1949, the Communist Party left the mountains and gorges to take to the cities, and their victory was proclaimed in Peking. Since then, they have neglected the countryside from which they came and sacrificed it to benefit the cities, despite a few projects of more ideological than practical value, and of which the results were, to say the least, deceptive. Today, the Party wants to return to the countryside, but with a new approach this time.

When visiting the old revolutionary bases, Hu Yaobang attempts to explain all this to his old comrades-in-arms who have never left the world of wild backwoods, where the Party used to hide and where the communist spirit was so pure. But these areas are still poor, despite the communist spirit. Is not that unjust? As it would be unjust to leave any sector of the community, whether urban or provincial, sunk in poverty? What feelings of resentment may not these misfits one day have in a so-called socialist society? The Party is striving for greater prosperity for all, and it hopes that with its present policies, the promises it made to all oppressed Chinese will come true. It has not lost sight of its ideals, but is merely seeking a realistic way of reaching them (*People's Daily*, October 30, 1984).

### *Realism*

The government has refused to take on all the country's misfortunes, but it is trying by economic measures to help those who cannot help themselves. Relying on the principle that money breeds money, it has granted temporary aid and more favourable regulations to the poorest regions and individuals, in order to give them a boost along the road to prosperity.

A State Council document, dated September 29, 1984, acknowledges in its introduction that subsidies granted to poor regions have not helped their economic development but, on the contrary, have kept people in a state of dependence. So, from now on, instead of bolstering collectivization and planning, the Chinese authorities will be granting greater freedom to individuals and small units.

In these regions, policy is even more liberal, with lighter taxes and preferential investments to encourage business, and pecuniary advantages to attract technical and qualified personnel to develop the economy. The State itself has agreed to help with the construction of roads and schools, and local authorities have been asked to organize management and set up sales' networks. The people have been called upon to shake off their attitude of dependence and to unite their efforts with those of the authorities to get the maximum profits from their farms, crafts and small factories. It is to be a concerted effort, where the State's help will be combined with local initiative. However, old habits, geographical conditions and a lack of appropriate personnel suggest that these measures are due to a central decision rather than to local demand. It is for this reason that training local cadres, so that they may understand and accept the new policies, remains as crucial as injecting capital and technology.

### *A Surprising Number of Poor*

What is true of the regions is true of the people. In various parts of the country, groups have been established to help families in trouble. The number of people who have been declared poor is surprising. The *Economic Daily* (December 29, 1984) talks of 50 million peasants with an annual income of less than 120 RMB, of whom 10 million have an income of less than 50 RMB. These statistics serve to underline the fact that remedies are urgently needed to alleviate a situation of astonishing proportions, considering the years of "collectivism" and egalitarian doctrine.

### *The Poverty Threshold*

How did it happen? The poverty threshold varies from province to province. In one township in Shanxi, it is set at an income of 100 RMB, in another in Hubei at 120 RMB (*People's Daily*, November 1, 1984). Although the government is still distributing food and clothing to the most needy, it refuses to continue giving handouts indefinitely. Such methods do not fundamentally solve problems and even enable some parasites to live off the rest of society (*Chinese Legislation Gazette*, October 15, 1984). Aid teams



have been formed to re-establish confidence to teach trades and to grant loans to set the ball rolling. Sometimes, local authorities undertake large-scale public works such as roads, building or irrigation projects. Rarely is it a question of employing more workers in existing factories, since this would be contrary to the very concept of profitability the authorities are trying so hard to emphasize. In turn, the "wealthy" have been called upon to consider those less fortunate than themselves. They can invest capital by building schools or setting up factories to employ peasants whose land is insufficient for their needs. Families of soldiers killed in action and accident victims are given special consideration.

There are some people who are no longer useful in economic terms — the old. These, nevertheless, can be of great assistance in the home, looking after children, for example, or they can give up their savings to help a young couple start a home. They certainly deserve respect and consideration. Pension funds have been set up for them, hostels built, activities organized . . . But in China, as elsewhere, they remain a problem for a society which equates gain with virtue and where a job is almost the only means of social integration. The Chinese authorities have taken care of them, extolling the virtues of the family while rationalizing the social welfare system.

### *Social Integration of the Handicapped*

There are other social groups, including both young and old, who are different from their peers — the physically handicapped, the blind, the deaf and the mute. Sometimes, local authorities show their good will by granting them privileges, such as free travel on public transport in Tongchuan city. Such compassion, however admirable, does not solve the basic problem facing society. The physically handicapped should be able to take an active part in the life of the country. Already in 1984, 230 disabled people were accepted in higher education establishments where they were previously denied entry because of their disabilities. The argument in earlier days had been that the State could not invest in unprofitable students who would be difficult to employ after the completion of their studies. Fortunately,

times have changed. An exceptional intellect is, no doubt, required to make up for physical deficiencies, but at least the notion of employability itself has changed (*People's Daily*, December 30, 1984).

As for the mentally handicapped, they are very seldom mentioned in the press, except when families place notices in the classified sections about mentally handicapped relatives gone missing. However, a report in the *People's Daily* on January 24, 1985, mentioned schools which specialized in the education of mentally retarded children . . .

### *Virtue as an Economic Value*

In line with standard practice in China and the rest of the world, the Chinese Communist Party punctuates its speeches on economic affairs with moralizing exhortations. The connection between economic demands and moral criteria is, however, not always clear. Or, rather, a superficial understanding of man and his relationships leads to economic misjudgement. In a "philosophical" commentary on the subject of economic structural reforms, Lan Xiuliang states that the mistake in the policy of collectivization-at-any-price was to believe that merely satisfying collective needs was legitimate. Man was denied his individuality in a world where only the group counted or, to go one step further, only the State . . .

What has morality to do with economic reforms? Although the commentator does not explicitly say so, he makes it quite clear that all economic policy should be derived from the basic premise that man is both an individual and a social being. In his opinion, the policy which succeeds in harmonizing the interests of the individual and the group is the best. The balance will always be fragile. At every step, it is necessary to avoid egoistical behaviour, on the one hand, and lazy recourse to the bottomless purse of the impersonal State on the other.

### *Wealth is not an Evil*

The system of economic responsibility introduced in China, the commentator continues, is original because it has established a relationship between the three major politico-economic forces — the State, the community and the individual — which is as harmonious as possible. Here,

it would be possible to cite in conclusion the law of the distribution of profit, where the largest portion is assigned to the State, the middle-sized to the community and the remainder to the individual. But Lan Xiuliang has included some value judgements which give a different slant to his paper. Firstly, he says that wealth is no more intrinsically evil than poverty is good, a point already made by Deng Xiaoping. Those who are nostalgic for the past have to accept that times have changed and revolutionary, wartime priorities and age-old peasant values are no longer appropriate. The family unit is still important, but not as a self-sufficient economic entity. If values, good for their own time, are to be rejected, then new and better ones must take their place. Individual initiative, for example, is both useful economically and an excellent means of expressing and developing the personality.

With prosperity, the individual gradually discovers that wealth is not sufficient in itself. He may find the necessary stimulus for activity within the new economic framework, but he will become aware that it does not fulfil all his requirements. Competition, for example, demands that the competitor be crushed or at least left to his own devices. However much the government may trim its policies to correct the balance in that daily struggle where only the best man wins, it will never eliminate the sometimes necessary call on man's generosity and assistance, to give something for nothing. Although virtue is not an economic factor in the ordinary sense, it appears to be necessary for the smooth running of even the best economic system.

The commentator then goes on to talk about the humanist spirit. He concludes by recommending that, during the implementation of the reforms, education in moral values be not forgotten; but does not specify further. And so the concept of humanism, which was the object of so much controversy at the end of 1983 and the beginning of 1984, returns once more.

### *The Rehabilitation of Bourgeois Humanism*

Humanism, so decried and so laboriously explained from the socialist viewpoint only a few months ago, has been rehabilitated with even greater insistence by Deng Pufang,

Deng Xiaoping's handicapped son (*Peking Daily*, December 7, 1984). The speech he made at the general meeting of the Chinese Foundation for the Help of the Physically Handicapped was published in the *People's Daily*.

Without any theoretical quibbling, Deng Pufang stated quite simply that, to date, the capitalist countries have done more and better than China for the physically disabled, because they have a greater respect for the human being. This is a serious assertion, he added, since a political regime and social system is most often judged on its social welfare record. If socialism and communism do nothing for the unfortunate, they will be discredited. This, he argued, raises the question to the highest political level, by questioning the very legitimacy of the regime. During his Hong Kong visit, Deng Pufang described the progress his country had already made; free medical care, mutual aid funds and so on. Yet the problem remains essentially one of attitude to human distress, and, on this score, he felt bound to admit that he sometimes felt ashamed of Chinese society.

Deng Pufang then went on to describe, indignantly, the attitude of Chinese children and adults who make fun of the disabled and throw stones at what they consider to be worthless creatures. It is impossible to put this sort of behaviour down to bourgeois or capitalist habits, he said, for people in capitalist societies are more humane. He then lays the blame for the evil on China's feudal past.

### *Give Help and Receive Spiritual Energy in Return*

The final sentence of Deng Pufang's speech stresses the depth of his understanding of the problems he is dealing with when he says that each member of the Foundation "should include handicapped people among his friends, that he might give them practical help and receive spiritual energy in return".

... From all these ideas, two fundamental facts emerge: firstly, that moral virtue is an essential factor in the smooth running of any economic system and, secondly, that concern for the individual is vital for social harmony. These considerations should continue to inspire Chinese men of letters and men of action to further broaden their political philosophy, with all its implications and applications.



# A Statement on Matters of Concern to Many Catholics

## PRO ECCLESIA ET PONTIFICE

“SINCE, in this age of ours, new problems are arising and extremely serious errors are gaining currency which tend to undermine the foundations of religion, the moral order and human society itself, this sacred Synod earnestly exhorts laymen, each according to the mind of the Church, to explain and defend Christian principles and to apply them rightly to the problems of our era . . . they must act in communion with their brothers in Christ, especially with their pastors. The latter must make a judgment about the true nature and proper use of these gifts, not in order to extinguish the Spirit, but to test all things and hold fast to what is good”.

*Decree on the Laity, Second Vatican Council*

It is in the light of the above exhortation that PRO ECCLESIA ET PONTIFICE addressed their pastors, the Bishops of England and Wales, on matters which are causing grave concern among many lay people in their care, at a Meeting held on Saturday, 22nd February at the Porchester Hall, Bayswater, W.2.

We deeply regret that:

- 1) the Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales signed their collective official Response to the documents produced by ARCIC (the Anglican Roman Catholic International Committion) and thus endorsed the false statement that “The Second Vatican Council . . . rejected the position that the Church of God is co-extensive with the Roman Catholic Church and is exclusively embodied in the Church”. This apparent denial of the identity of of the Church as the One True Church appears to be reaffirmed by the participation of all Bishops in the United Kingdom (those of Scotland as well as England and Wales) in the oecumenical Lenten Campaign based

on the resource book *What on Earth is the Church for?* (published jointly by the Catholic Truth Society and the British Council of Churches) which states (p. 41): "In the Second Vatican Council the Bishops declined to identify exclusively and completely the one true Church of Christ with the Roman Catholic Church", and this, despite the fact that the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has insisted that "there is only one body in which the true Church has existence" and that the words "*Ecclesia subsistit*" (*Lumen Gentium*) must be translated as "the Church exists ONLY in".

- 2) there has been no repudiation from the hierarchy of *Our Faith Story* by the Rev. A. Patrick Purnell, J.J., National Advisor for Religious Education, England Wales in which book the National Advisor expresses his conviction (cf. p. 75) that, as a consequence of the prevailing de-Christianisation of society, "Catechesis may well not be appropriate to a class-room setting" even in Catholic Schools. Similarly, there has been no repudiation of *The Teaching of the Catholic Church. A New Catechism* by Father Herbert McCabe, O.P. This work cannot be considered a true catechism in that it does not cover the entire faith nor can it be said to truly represent the teaching of the Catholic Church on many doctrines, most notably Heaven, Hell and Purgatory.
- 3) the Universal Indult of October 1984 permitting the use of the Roman Missal of Pope John XXIII (1962) has not been applied in our country as generously as the Holy Father intended in his "solicitude and care" for those of his children who remain attached to the 'Tridentine Mass'. We particularly regret the attitude of those Bishops who have withheld permission for such celebrations legitimately requested by the faithful. Liturgical abuses continue unabated in many parishes to the distress and scandalisation of the laity; in particular, the use of female altar servers; readings and prayers are continually omitted, or altered at the whim of the celebrant, while "ad libbing" has become an accepted practice at

a time when the sense of the sacred in the worship of the Church is deteriorating rapidly, we regret that our Bishops have decided to introduce the reception of Holy Communion under both kinds. This can only lead to a further diminution of the doctrine that Our Lord is received, Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity, under either kind alone. It is also regrettable that while the laymen can choose, the administering priest has no choice.

- 4) our Bishops remained silent on the showing in this country of the sacrilegious and blasphemous film "Je vous salue Marie". We deplore the praise given to it by Catholic priests and leading lay people invited to a special preview; that a Society including priests should publicly advocate respect for active homosexuality and should advise that active homosexuals be employed in schools and in other places where young people meet.
- 5) political views are expressed by members of the Hierarchy and by many priests and are, in fact, proclaimed from the pulpit. We believe it is for the layman to study policies and come to his own decision, in the light of the Gospel and his Catholic upbringing.

We regret all these things and consider that *Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice* has the right to join with their fellow Catholics of like mind in seeking to alert the faithful to this sad state of affairs. So long as these conditions obtain, *Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice* will continue to advise Catholics to contrive to save their souls and the souls of all those for whom they are responsible — either directly or indirectly — without the help we should be receiving from the official leadership of the Church in our countries who seem unaware of, or unconcerned about, the continuing massive fall in the practice of the Faith over the past 20 years. We feel that the situation of the Catholic Church in England is much worse than at the time of the Reformation and we call upon the intercession of Saint John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, Saint Thomas More and the many Martyrs who suffered and died for the Faith we hold.

In this, his concluding article on last year's Extraordinary Synod, Philip Trower presents an interesting critique of Italian Press Comment on that event; then gives his own concluding thoughts on the Synod itself. He sees it on the whole as expressive of a swing towards realism within the Church's episcopate.

# The Extraordinary Synod

## 4: THE ITALIAN PRESS: FINAL THOUGHTS

PHILIP TROWER

VATICAN CITY—The bustle and stir around St. Peter's Square, which inevitably accompanies a great ecclesiastical event in Rome, has subsided. Most of the cardinals and bishops have gone home. The Vatican Press Office, all but empty of reporters, looks like a room the day after a party. Official attention is now focussing on the next undertaking, the Pope's visit to India, but in the piazza itself, a giant Christmas tree is being hoisted into position.

What then of the Extraordinary Synod? Was it a success or a failure? Did utopianism prevail (the implementation of the Second Vatican Council over the last 20 years has been mainly on track—insofar as there have been mistakes and misinterpretations, they have been relatively unimportant—the gains far outweigh them); or realism (abuses and misinterpretations are widespread and deep-rooted, leading at least in the First World, in Cardinal Ratzinger's words, to a period of post-conciliar decadence, which can only be corrected by a serious reappraisal of the situation and positive remedies)?

These, I believe, are the only terms in which what has been happening in Rome over the last two weeks can be intelligently discussed. The idea that some kind of a



repudiation of the Council was contemplated either by the Pope, Cardinal Ratzinger, or anyone else is simply a tactical ploy on the part of those who, for whatever reason, refuse to read the signs of the times provided by statistics—though the writing on Balthasar's dining room wall can hardly have been much clearer—and recognize that the reforms themselves by this time need to some degree “reforming”. The number of Catholics hostile to the Council as such is manifestly minimal. But so successful have the utopians been at spreading abroad the contrary idea, that even the Holy Father has been compelled to talk as if there were some substance in it, at least to the extent of insisting he and the Holy See have not been guilty of evil designs. In other words, the pseudo-scenario constructed by the utopians has meant that a great deal of time and energy has had to be wasted by everyone proving the obvious.

No doubt, after reading the Synod's three final documents—the Fathers' message to the People of God, the Pope's address in reply, and the final report or *relatio*—readers will have started to draw their own conclusions about whether the views of the utopians or realists carried the day.

### *The Wishes of the Pope*

Before presenting my own thoughts, after two and one-half weeks in Rome, I will, at the request of the editor, first give some reactions of the Italian press.

Most of what has so far appeared there is commentary on the Synod's final report and what Archbishop Schotte, secretary general of the Permanent Synod Secretariat, said about it when presenting it to journalists two days later at the concluding press conference.

The report and the Pope's decision to make it public represent in some respects a return to earlier practice. The bishops have issued no report of their own since, I think, the 1974 Synod. The other unusual feature is that it is addressed to the whole Church rather than to the Pope alone. “Progressivism” regards all this as a notable victory, making the Church look more “democratic”, and seeming to enhance the bishop's authority at the expense of the Pope. Whether or not it is a victory, I will consider later.

The papers I have chosen to quote from represent all

shades of the political and religious spectrum. It should be remembered that in Italy "liberal" often means economically and politically conservative. I have taken the papers in no particular order.

The approach of *Il Messagero* (secular; centre-left) seems to me the most interesting.

Under the headline "A Parliament in the Church?", it begins with the suggestion that the most disappointed members of the public have been the "hordes" of pressmen sent over by the American media, who were expecting violent clashes between the supporters and opponents of Ratzinger, progressives and "restorationists", or between the bishops and the Pope.

All this, however, *Il Messagero* thinks, is not because there were no serious differences of opinion among the Synod Fathers, but because there have been two "synods". In the actual Synod, just ended, the wishes of the Pope have been carried out, as was bound to happen. The necessary suggestions as to how the presentation of the conciliar teaching should be adjusted, the necessary criticism of the way it has been implemented, have been made. The concept of the Church as People of God should receive less emphasis; the word "pluriformity"—less "problematical and more controllable" according to *Messagero*—is to be substituted for "pluralism"; Cardinal Ratzinger's central point that the power of episcopal conferences ought to be decreased and that of individual bishops increased has been accepted.

For the last ten years a different debate has been going on, worldwide—*Messagero*'s Synod Number Two—which the Pope and his supporters have not necessarily won. Over the last two weeks *Messagero* continues, the interventions in the Synod Hall on collegiality and the relationship between Pope, bishops, and Curia, have "revived the emergence in the Church of 'parliamentarianism'; the demand for bishops to have a real share in the government of the Church. It is as though the internal dynamism of 'a vaguely parliamentary' institution like the Synod . . . tends of itself after 18 years toward the redistribution of power".

The Synod moderates, *Messagero* goes on, above all those in the German and Italian language working groups, halted the process as far as the present Synod is concerned. But, the writer believes, the problem is not one the Church

is going to shed easily. Indeed it is likely to intensify "as Catholics draw closer to Protestants and Orthodox, with their synodical forms of organization".

What the author overlooks of course is divine Providence and the action of the Holy Spirit.

### *A Caravan*

*Il Popolo* (Christian Democrat) carried three articles in one issue. "No Restoration" is the title of Carlo Albertini's piece. The Synod, he says, has been described as the Synod of the disappointed; first those who expected an anti-conciliar restoration; secondly, those who hoped for a clash between "traditionalists and Modernists"; and thirdly those who expected that due to shortness of time the Synod documents would evade serious consideration of the great problems of man. All these groups were wrong, the author maintains. The Synod has reaffirmed the teaching of Vatican II; has shown its unity with the Pope; has boldly tackled difficult themes like responsible procreation (I can think of only one bishop, the Archbishop of Salzburg, who did), the option for the poor, the rediscovery of the sacred, etc. The Synod was like a mini-Council. Much of this was due to the majority of bishops coming from the Third World. They had greater energy and a fresher outlook, the writer implies, than their world-weary First World counterparts.

The second article, entitled, "Church Confirms Vatican II's Great Decisions", is by Pope John XXIII's one-time secretary, Msgr. Loris Capovilla, now Bishop of Loreto. The Bishop, who naturally wants to vindicate the work initiated by his revered master, writes mostly in praise of the Council. People should ask themselves, he says, how we would have extricated ourselves from the network of snares and problems of the second half of this century without that great event. Certainly, he continues, the path from the Council to today has not been a freeway, but more like a caravan route compelling voyagers to adapt themselves to the irregularities of the ground. But risks are written into the logic of work and progress.

Elena Amadini in her piece, "New Guidelines for the Council", on the other hand, is more reflective. Comment-

ing on the bishops' admission that "we have perhaps spoken too much of renewing the external structures of the Church and not enough of God and Christ", she remarks there that it is "an admission which Catholics have perhaps been waiting for as long as time".

In reference to this admission, Archbishop Schotte at the final press conference spoke of the bishops "beating their breasts". Archbishop Schotte, incidentally, was everything that is encouraging. He drew the reporters' attention to all that was good in the final report and made little of its less satisfactory features.

*La Stampa*, with the headline, "We Were Wrong, Say Bishops", also underscored the episcopal breast-beating.

Under the title "Pope Warns Rebels", *Corriere della Sera* (liberal-conservative) for Dec. 9th quotes the Pope's invitation to our Lady at St. Mary Major's on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception: "Bring back to the unity of ecclesial communion those who have strayed from it or broken it through rebellion, disobedience, and sin. Defend your sons in the struggle against the power of darkness and against the insidious power of error and falsehood".

*La Stampa*, however, seems to identify rebellion mainly with "traditionalism". The article also refers to the dinner the Pope gave for the Synod Fathers on the evening of Dec. 7th and repeats the story that he laughingly quoted a letter from Archbishop Lefebvre who apparently said that the Pope would be a "bad pastor" (*cattivo pastore*) if he didn't put the Council into reverse.

*Il Tempo* (Catholic) which also carried the story describes the final report as "A Strategy for the Third Millennium". Alongside it runs an interview with Archbishop McGrath of Panama.

"It was necessary", the Archbishop said, "for the Synod to speak of the Church as mystery and communion" because "in spite of great work the Council had achieved, it did not put enough emphasis on interior conversion and spiritual renewal. The communion of the Church is not like a cooperative, but a reflection of the communion of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. All this must be understood before we turn our attention to the problems of the world".



### *"Back to the Council"*

*Il Tempo* and *Avennire* (reportedly owned by the Italian youth movement *Communione e Liberazione*) gave fullest coverage to the Synod. *Avennire* printed the final report in full, which it said would lead to a new and fuller knowledge of the Council.

"Back to the Council", according to *Nazione*, is the pith of the Synod's message—assuming, it says, that the Synod's results could be compressed into a slogan. But will a universal catechism muzzle the bishops? In reply, *Nazione's* religious writer quotes the substance of Archbishop Schotte's answer to a journalist who put a similar question to him. If the catechism is a compendium of essential points of doctrine, how can bishops who are supposed to be one in faith disagree with it? In what sense therefore can it be said to muzzle them?

*Il Giornale* (liberal) writes that "with the publication of the final report . . . everything that can be officially known about the Extraordinary Synod on the 20 years since the Vatican Council has become available. To learn anything more one will have to wait for individual participants to circulate their private confidences". Meanwhile the final report is "a prudent document . . . respectful of the Council decrees yet which in a striking way reflects Ratzinger's *Report on the Faith* as does the *relatio* of the German language small working group". The article also quotes Cardinal Siri's intervention of Nov. 29th. "We are not here to put the Council on trial, but ourselves", and also, "to put an end to 20 years' worth of theological and practical errors".

### *Other Images*

In its Sunday edition for Dec. 8 before the final report was made available to journalists, *La Repubblica* (liberal-socialist, but with an extra well-informed ex-Franciscan religious affairs correspondent) carried two articles on the results of the Synod—one entitled "Ratzinger Has Conquered—The Church Has a Single Catechism", and the other "Requiem for the People of God—The Synod Reproposes the Distinction Between the Sacred and Human Superseded by the Council". In preferring other images to that of the People of God, the author says, the Synod

Fathers were unquestionably motivated by the desire to avoid the risk of sociological and ideological interpretations, and spiritualize the notion of the Church. "Nonetheless people and People of God were key phrases of the Council. The Synod has listened to Ratzinger's criticism of it".

Analyzing the final report two days later under the title "Pope Wojtyla Warns the Bishops 'No to Pluralism in the Church'," *La Repubblica* complains that a lesser assembly like the Synod cannot validate the work of a higher body like a general council.

The same issue carries an article about Cardinal Danneel's visit on his way home to Brussels to Cardinal Martini, Archbishop of Milan. Cardinal Martini had not been invited to take part in the Synod, and Cardinal Danneels, it seems, stopped off to tell his friend what had been happening. "Dressed in *clergyman*, with a small pectoral cross the only sign of his episcopal dignity", Cardinal Danneels also explained the result of the Synod to a gathering of the Milanese clergy and "ecclesiastical operatives". (Is it possible that one way of reinstilling a sense of the sacred in the young would be for bishops as well as priests to dress more as such?)

The Cardinal, according to the article's author, defended the Council "a good deal more perhaps than the final report does. . . We ask ourselves, "the Cardinal said, "whether without the Council the dykes would not have broken". The remedies for abuses (the author was under the impression he was referring to liberation theology) "could not be disciplinary and administrative sanctions, which are pre-conciliar methods". Since only a third of the Synod Fathers had taken part in the Council, the Cardinal also had doubts as to whether the other two-thirds had read the text. About a single catechism he supposedly said, "It is impossible to make a catechism for the whole world. There was strong opposition to the term catechism. There will be a reference book. Nothing like the Council of Trent". To begin with, he observed, the Pope had not wanted a final report for instant publication. "The Council is what it is", the Pope had remarked. "What can I add to it?" The insistence of the Bishops had obtained what Danneels had defined as a turning point. . . "It constitutes a precedent from which there is no turning back". To Cardinal Martini's question,

"What is now left of the Council?" the Belgian Cardinal, according to *La Reppublica's* correspondent, replied: "An African Bishop has told me his problem is not religious liberty, but the difficulty of explaining why Christ is not black". (Why this is supposed to be an answer to Cardinal Martini's question, I am not quite sure.)

### *A Swing Towards Realism*

Whether these various assessments of the Synod are right or wrong, they each, I think, shed a bit of light on the total picture. Indeed the reports have become part of the picture, since what men think has happened is in the end as much an historic fact influencing the subsequent events as what has taken place.

My own view is that if realism has not won an outright victory at the Synod, the balance has swung way over in its favor, and to a far, far greater degree than could have been expected even up to a short time before the Synod ended.

The summaries of the interventions during the first week certainly did not suggest that the final report would have so much backbone in it. And even if what we were told during the second week was happening in the *circules minores* sounded more promising, the Fathers' message to the People of God, available to journalists 48 hours before the final report, was like a bucket of cold water, at least to my hopes. The sentence, "We do not want to dwell upon the errors, confusions, and defects which, because of sin and human weakness, have been the occasion of sufferings in the midst of the People of God", certainly did not seem to suggest a serious determination to come to grips with heresy and rebellion.

The most obvious explanation for the contrast between the tone and substance of the final report and the tone and substance of the preceding discussions is that the discussions represented the minds of the Bishops while the report was written by Vatican officials, and one can imagine which publications would probably be offering that interpretation. In fact, it is reported on good authority that Cardinal Danneels' first draft of the final report was much weaker and that the document received a good deal of its present force as a result of the interventions by individual Fathers

when it was debated in the Synod Hall. One was told that the Holy Father had been praying for a miracle in regard to the Synod, and it looks as if he got one.

Descending from miraculous to natural causes, the final report also shows the good results that can flow from contacts between bishops at a Synod. It exposes the individual bishop, as to a lesser extent it can expose individual journalists, to a wider vision of the Church and its problems than that which he may have at home.

### *Startling Admissions*

Obviously the most precious result of the Synod is the acceptance by the Bishops of the idea of the universal catechism. No doubt this is one of the chief objectives the Pope had in mind in calling the Synod. If this had been the Synod's only result, the time and trouble would have been worthwhile. Modernism has been resisting the idea of such a catechism for years. A priest who has reported many Synods told me that at almost every meeting since 1974 a proportion of Fathers has asked for universal catechisms and the idea has repeatedly been turned down. The opponents of the idea may now talk about a compendium rather than a catechism. A compendium means a collection of "sources" for teaching the Faith, like the French *Pierres Dizantes*, rather than a systematic exposition of Catholic belief, but I doubt if the Holy Father went to so much labor to get the College's support for yet another "reference book".

The second most important result, I believe, is the Fathers' admission that the Council, while never teaching error, was not in every point and part absolutely flawless. "In no way can it be affirmed", they say in one of their most startling admissions, and there are a surprising number of them, "that everything which took place after the Council was called by the Council". If everything is not to be blamed on the Council, the sense is clearly that they consider some things oddities. Implicitly at least the same admission is made when they insist that the "Council is not known". Even if millions of Catholics have never opened a copy of the conciliar decrees, nevertheless there can hardly be any collection of documents in recent times that has in



fact been so widely read and commented on. How then can they be said not to be known? Unless we are to assume that all the misinterpretations have been willful, the answer must surely be that the decrees contain imprecisions and lacunae that need to be filled in or clarified. On this point, the report's recommendations seem somewhat unrealistic. The remedy for ignorance of the conciliar teaching is surely not a flood of new books about the Council, as the Fathers recommend, as there have already been more than enough of them. All that is wanted is books that give a truly Catholic exposition of the text.

Thirdly (and it may well be that this point should have been put first) we have the Fathers' recognition that the presentation of the Faith at almost every level and at almost every sphere of Catholic life, has been disastrously desupernaturalized. The idea is expressed in a number of ways. The need for penance and adoration is stressed. Popular devotions are praised. But in general it takes the form of a demand that the Cross and Mystery be put back into the Catholic vision of sin. One cannot help wondering whether God has not allowed the fundamentalist sects which the Fathers are so worried about to prosper for a time, in order to get this idea across. Why have Catholics in certain parts of the world been abandoning the Church in droves and joining sects? At last, as we say in England, the penny has dropped.

### *A Final Thought*

Of all the ideas launched by the Council those of integral salvation and transforming the world as the Christian's primary vocation seem to me the ones in most urgent need of clarification. The Good Thief can hardly be considered to have been an ornament of society or a promoter of human development, and I don't see how salvation can be called integral in the sense of simultaneously reaching a state of physical as well as spiritual beatitude. But he unquestionably reached the only kind of salvation worth having.

Where are they indeed ? In this stimulating article, Father Bryan Houghton reveals himself as of the same mind as Cardinal Ratzinger, who wrote in his now famous Report : "What the Church needs in order to respond to the needs of man in every age is holiness, not management".

## Where Are the Saints ?

FR. BRYAN HOUGHTON

I HAVE one fault to find with John-Paul II: he says so many interesting things that it would require a computer to index them. I am consequently unable to find the references but remember that at least twice he has drawn attention to the plethora of saints who vitalised the decisions of the Council of Trent, whereas we are still waiting for a few saints to vitalise Vatican II. The remark is as interesting as it is profound.

### *Today's Unknown Martyrs*

Our Holy Father cannot be thinking about martyrs. If the Reformation produced them by the score, Communism and other forms of Liberation have produced them by the thousand. Never in the history of the Church have there been so many martyrs as in the 75 years of my lifetime. What is surprising is not the lack of martyrs but their lack of recognition. For instance, at the Reformation our English martyrs sent a devout shudder down every spine in Christendom. To this day you can see frescos, pictures, altars in their honour in Rome, Naples, Cadiz and elsewhere. But is there a single chapel in the West, in Europe or the Americas, which has a chapel dedicated to the martyrs in the East— Just a tiny little chapel with only one kneeler, not merely for the martyrs in Europe, but for those of China, Indo-China, the Lebanon and even Africa, as well as Latin America? I know of none. On "Armistice Day" we pay homage to the Unknown Soldier. This is admirable. But I fail to see why Catholics should not pay homage to

the myriad of their "unknown martyrs". This is abysmal. We do not lack martyrs. It is they who lack our recognition.

But perhaps the Holy Father is thinking of totally dedicated "administrative" saints, such as Pius V or Charles Borromeo? They may be inconspicuous in the West but the East has certainly produced them. Have we already forgotten Beran of Prague, Mindszenty of Hungary, Wyszynski of Warsaw and above all the Ukrainian, Josef Slipjy (irrespective of spelling)? The last-named was certainly made of the stuff of saints, which did not prevent him from being treated as shoddy. Again, it is not the saint but recognition which is lacking.

### *Jesuits and others at and after Trent*

Perhaps it is the Religious Orders which our Pope has in mind? It is true that the Jesuits were founded before Trent. But it is equally true that St. Ignatius himself and most of his early companions (Sts. Peter Faber and Francis Xavier) survived to see the Council. Indeed, one of the *clichés* against Trent is that it was a Jesuitical affair. If one felt so disposed, one could say the same of Vatican II: Teilhard de Chardin provided the secenario; Kark Rahner the theology; dear but romantic Andreas Jungmann the liturgy. Both equations are absurd. What is true is that in both cases the Jesuits, with their usual dedication, epitomized a movement. It is exactly what Father Paul Crane is doing today. Incidentally, the most important (but laborious) thesis for a Doctorate which I can imagine would be the "Shifts in spirituality in the Society of Jesus between its Suppression in 1773 and its near Collapse in 1973".

However, let us return to our Pope and the saints of Trent. Nobody can deny the expansion of sanctity in the Society during and after the Council of Trent. There are charming young men like Stanislaus Kostka and Aloysius Gonzaga; learned theologians such as Peter Canisius and Robert Bellarmine; even a canonised General in Francis Borgia. There seem to have been a few inhibitions in *recognizing* sanctity where it existed.

But apart from the Jesuits and within the era of Trent, there is the foundation of the Theatines by St. Cajetan; of the Barnabites by St. Antonio-Maria Zaccaria; of the Hos-

pitallers by St. John of God; of the homes for the dying by St. Camillus de Lellis; above all, of the Oratory of St. Philip de Neri and (in France) of Berulle. It is a formidable list, even though I rely on my failing memory and have left out the Congregations of Women.

### *Vatican II and Enthusiasts*

In this field I am obliged to admit that Vatican II seems to be lacking. Mind you, there have been foundations. There is *Opus Dei* in which His Holiness places much hope. There is also Archbishop Lefèbvre's Confraternity of St. Pius X and a host of smaller religious foundations of which the most important is the Benedictine Monastery at Le Barroux. But alas! from Lefèbvre to Le Barroux they are all marginal to the hierarchical Church. This is interesting: whereas the Tridentine Church was capable of absorbing all religious foundations, the Church of Vatican II feels obliged to reject them. The fact is that Trent was primarily interested in doctrine; it consequently rejected the Protestants but made room for its "enthusiasts" in the Religious Orders, Vatican II was primarily interested in pastoral problems; it consequently rejected its "enthusiasts" as being divisive misfits, but is open to a pastoral approach in oecumenicity and inculturation.

Whatever one may think about absorption and rejection — and it is an unfortunate fact that some traditionalists have become so fossilised as to defy digestion — nevertheless, the Holy See is unlikely to get out of its present crisis of authority until it takes firmly into its own hands, as the Universal Ordinary, the direction of the universal Religious Orders. I wonder if an Extraordinary Synod of Religious, men and women, would not bear more fruit than a Synod of bishops? They might again start manufacturing saints as the Pope requires and as they did after Trent.

### *Mystics Today and Yesterday*

Then, of course, there are the great mystics. Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross were born well before Trent; they lived through it and survived it. Mary-Magdalene dei Pazzi was a real child of Trent as she was born in 1566. Can we boast as much? It is very difficult to say. Two



stigmatics of indubitable sanctity were alive during and after Vatican II: Padre Pio and Marthe Robin. The treatment meted out to the former passes belief — even his confessional was 'bugged'. As for Marthe Robin, she was kept under lock and key after she had advised Mgr. Lefebvre to open a seminary. Fair enough: it is the Pope, not the saint, who is infallible and enunciates the Magisterium of Holy Church. Anybody else? Well, yes! And this is extraordinary when you consider the number of people whom you can possibly know against the number which exists. There is the astonishing Franco-Egyptian converted Jew, educated at Oxford, who became a Dominican: Jean de Menasce. If you can find a copy and read French, then buy *La Porte sur le Jardin* (Editions CERF, Paris 1975). Him I knew. I do not know the anonymous author of *L'Ermitage* (Martingay, B.P. 131, Geneva, CH 1211). And I have corresponded with a Carmelite Father etc. . . . I do not mention women merely because I have never had the spiritual direction of nuns. But I have met one.

In spite of the complaints of the Holy Father, of course Holy Church produces holy Jos and holy Janes. What is true, however, is that the process has become even more difficult than usual in the wake of Vatican II — and this for deeper reasons than mere recognition.

### *Activity Substituted for Being*

No Catholic can conceive of sanctifying himself outside the Church. To us, it is the Church which is Holy whereas we are sinners. A saint is begotten by the Church, just as Jesus was begotten by its prototype, the Blessed Virgin Mary. Very well. What, then, is the ethos, the atmosphere we breathe in our post-Vatican Church? Is it penance, gratitude, sacrifice, adoration, recollection, abnegation, total surrender, disinterested devotion, joyful resignation and the rest — attitudes which affect our inner life, our very being, what we *are*? And, after all, a saint *is*, irrespective of what he *does*. No, none of this seems to interest the post-Vatican Church. It is primarily occupied with structures and human activity: collegiality, subsidiarity;

national, diocesan and parochial councils; ecclesiastical democracy; married priests and women priests; lay deacons and lay participation generally; penitential services without confession; lay communion from the chalice; eucharists without priests; oecumenicity without dogmas; contraception and so on. I feel sure that to some people such problems seem fascinating, but to meditate on them is not conducive to sanctity. The crisis in the modern Church is really quite simple: we have substituted *activity* for *being*. The false, "existentialist" question is: "Tell me what you do and I shall tell you what you are". The question for sanctity is more complex: "Tell me what you want to *be* and I shall tell you what to do". If our Pope really wants more saints, that is the question which he should ask and to which he has the answer.

### *Structures or Sanctity*

To sum up. Our Holy Father complains that Vatican II has produced no saints. I sincerely hope that he is wrong and that it is a mere matter of "recognition". If he is right, then Holy Church is bankrupt. It has been a wonderful dream, so wonderful that it must have been true. As a convert, I did not fall in love with the Church's structures and my own activity. I fell in love with the holiness of Holy Church. But perhaps that, too, was selfish: I must still love her even when her holiness has vanished.

---

May I ask any of those few, who have not renewed their subscriptions during recent months, to be so kind as to do so without delay. If you do not wish to renew, it would be the greatest help if you would write to us cancelling it. I can assure you that no offence whatsoever will be taken! This request is made as a help to keeping our records in order. Thank you so much.

—Jaul Crane, S.J.

The article that follows is an analysis of what is called "liberation theology" in the light of the Instruction condemning it and published by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on August 6th, 1984. The perceptive clarity of its writing combines with an effective simplicity of exposition to make this article a remarkable piece of work; for which our thanks go to its Author. The concluding note on "Our Social Duties" is set within the American scene.

# An Analysis of "Liberation Theology"

FR. THOMAS O'MAHONY

## PART I

ON August 6, 1984 the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith under Cardinal Ratzinger issued a now famous analysis of the so-called "liberation theologies" gaining currency in Latin America, though in point of fact they are of Germanic origin, owing much of their anthropological and historical basis to "Rahner and Metz, with a background of Hegel and Marx" (Fr. Victorino Rodriguez y Rodriguez, O.P.).

Unfortunately, not too many Catholics have read this Instruction, *Libertatis Nuntius*, and so have little or no knowledge of the pernicious movement and its inherent dangers to the "poor", whom it proposes to help. Consequently, this brief excursus is intended as commentary on the Instruction or as an analysis of what is called "liberation theology".

The Instruction begins by reminding us that "the gospel of Jesus Christ is a message of freedom and a force for liberation" and condemns those "who maintain an attitude of neutrality and indifference in the face of the tragic and

pressing problems of human misery". Twenty centuries of Christianity have shown this to be true as is evident in the social teaching of the Magisterium, her consistent opposition in the teeth of persecution to tyrannies and other suppressions of human rights, and the lives of countless heroic members, who fulfilled the demands of justice and charity.

But in teaching the truths of Divine Revelation the Church drew up a true theology by reflecting on the sources of divine truth — sacred scripture, tradition and the Magisterium — and thus formulated a true and real theology of liberation, which lays primary emphasis on evangelization, the message of the gospel which is the "message of freedom and a force for liberation".

Pope John Paul II focussed on the very important truth in his address at Puebla when he spoke of the "three pillars" of any valid theology of liberation: "the truth about Jesus Christ, the truth about the Church, and the truth about mankind" (cf. the Instruction, V, 8). Paul VI had previously drawn attention to this pivotal point: "There is no new mankind if there are not first of all new men renewed by baptism and by lives according to the gospel". (*Apostolic Exhortation, Evangelii Nuntiandi*, December 8, 1975, N. 18.)

It is clear, then, that any attempt to build a just world, a "great society", is doomed to failure unless the supernatural regeneration of men of all classes is achieved. There is no other way. Full liberation from oppressive structures and other evils is impossible without liberation from sin, because these evils are a consequence of sin, original and personal.

Now it is precisely here that "liberation theologies" fail, because they concentrate on the concrete misery and oppression of the "poor" and then try to find an effective "praxis" (customary practice or action) to right these social wrongs. As the Instruction says: "What these 'liberation theologies' have embraced as a principle . . . is the theory of class struggle as the fundamental structural law of history" (ix, 2). For them, therefore, "the fundamental (Marxist) law of history, which is class struggle, implies that society is founded on violence" (viii, 6) and is effective



revolutionary praxis, as is stated in *Theology Drawn from the Praxis of Liberation*, by Hugo Assmann.

This, as is evident, is a total inversion of the theological method, as explained above. As the Instruction points out, theology is understood as the study of God and of creatures in relation to God, carried out in the light of divine revelation. Consequently, "liberation theology" is not a theology at all since God is not its primary object, but rather the movement best studied in the minds of these writers to bring about the socio-political emancipation of the oppressed.

"Liberation theology" (always used in quotes in the Instruction) is nothing more, says Cardinal Ratzinger, than a socio-political theory based on class struggle, the fundamental Marxist law of history.

"Liberation theologians", therefore, are not concerned with orthodoxy but rather with praxis i.e. the most effective means in their view to achieve quickly the liberation of the oppressed. As the Instruction states, liberation theology "is rather the subordination of every affirmation of the Faith or of theology to a political criterion dependent on the class struggle, the driving force of history" (ix, 6), and thus is "incompatible with the Christian faith" (*Op. cit.* Introduction), because events and projects are not judged according to the Faith, but rather the Faith according to events and projects.

But, in order to baptize this Marxist system its promoters dress it up in a religious garb by making a selective re-reading of sacred scripture and using the false hermeneutics of rationalism and liberal Protestantism as the Instruction puts it: "Non-criticized borrowings from the Marxist ideology and resorting to the thesis of a biblical hermeneutic dominated by Rationalism are the root of the new interpretation, which corrupts that which was authentic in the generous initial commitment in favor of the poor" (vi, 10).

This is an example of the method they use. In Luke 4: 16-22 Christ inaugurated His public ministry in the synagogue of Nazareth by quoting the prophecy of Isaiah 61: 1-2 concerning the Messiah, who was to bring good news to the "poor" and liberty to the "captives". As is

obvious from the Bible and the traditional teaching of the Church, the poor and captive mentioned were and are the spiritually deprived, who are held captive by the bonds of sin. Poverty and captivity were used as analogies. Liberation theologians, however, interpreted the above text as referring to the materially poor and so made them the subjects of the salvation promised by Christ; thus effectively ruling out the so-called "rich" from the divine economy of salvation.

Salvation history for the liberation theologians became the promotion of social revolution, by violent means, if necessary, and the unforeseen corollaries of this kind of theologizing are that the Kingdom of God was to be established on earth (the Communist Utopia), that the rich (middle class) were beyond salvation, and that evangelization was to be abandoned.

This methodology was clearly stated in 1951, by the Protestant theologian Paul Tillich in his *Systematic Theology*: "In using the method of correlation, systematic theology proceeds in the following way: it makes an analysis of the human situation out of which the existential questions arise, it demonstrates that the symbols used in the Christian message are the answers to these questions" (Vol. 1, University of Chicago Press, 1951, 9f). This view was later endorsed by the dissident theologian, Fr. Richard McBrien of Notre Dame in his 1970 book *The Credibility of the Church Today*: "As the theologian perceives change in the spiritual-cultural environment, he begins to recognize certain new questions which have relation to the message. And he re-interprets the message in the light of the changed situation; he confronts this new situation with the renewed symbols of Christian faith". Ex-priest Gregory Baum advanced the same view in 1968.

Writings most notorious for this position are by Gustavo Gutierrez, Hugo Assmann, J. L. Segundo, Leonardo Boff Joa Sobrino

It is no surprise, therefore, that the Instruction is extremely harsh in its critique. Such "theologies", it says, are "a perversion of the Christian message, as God has confided it to the Church, in such wise that this message is

questioned as a whole" (ix, 1), thus putting its promoters "in opposition to the Faith of the Church" (ix, 3).

## PART II

We now need to discuss the "preferential option for the poor" mentioned by Pope John Paul II in the hippodrome of Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, on October 11, 1984, which is referred to in the Instruction VI, 5. "The church", said the Pope, "must be completely faithful to her Lord, by putting that option into practice and offering her generous contribution to the work of 'social liberation' of the dispossessed multitudes, in order to attain a justice for all that will correspond to their dignity as men and as children of God".

But both the Pope and Cardinal Ratzinger warned that so-called "theologies of liberation" are using the Church's option for the poor as a pretext to betray the poor by making them into an instrument to implant socialism, or even worse, to imbue them with the unChristlike methods of Marxism, class-hatred and violence which will inevitably lead to Communist tyranny. To quote the Holy Father: "But that important and urgent task (of social liberation) must be carried out in an attitude of fidelity to the gospel which forbids recourse to methods of hate and violence" (Santo Domingo, October 11, 1984). The Instruction is equally clear, when it warns that in these so-called theologies "the Christian sense of the poor is perverted, and the struggle for the rights of the poor is transformed into class warfare in the ideological perspective of class struggle" (ix, 10).

Because of the perverted nature of "liberation theologies" as shown above, the Pope in his Santo Domingo address spelled out the criteria to be followed by the Church in working for social liberation. These are: "It must be carried out by maintaining a preferential option for the poor, that will not be exclusive nor excluding, as I myself have said on different occasions, but which will be open to all who work to leave sin behind and be converted in their hearts;

—"it must be carried out without viewing the poor as a class or in a class struggle, or as a Church separated from

- communion with and obedience to the shepherds appointed by Christ;
- “it must be carried out by looking at man in his earthly and eternal vocation;
- “it must be carried out without transformation of society exposing man to the risk of falling under systems that deprive him of his freedom and submit him to programs of atheism, like practical materialism, which despoil him of his internal and transcendental riches
- “it must be carried out in the knowledge that the primary liberation man must seek is liberation from sin, from the moral evil that finds shelter in his heart and which is the cause of ‘social sin’ and of oppressive structures”.

### PART III

“Liberation theologies” aim to “de-theologize” (the neologism is theirs) the Christian message, and consequently there is no real Christian content to their methodology. As the Instruction says, we find a “perversion of the Christian message, as God has confided it to the Church, in such wise that this message is questioned as a whole” (ix, 1); in fact, these systems are “in opposition to the faith of the church” (ix, 3).

The principal effects of the “de-theologizing” of divine revelation are mentioned in the Instruction, and are briefly summarized here:

a) An absence of the transcendent and personal sense of God, the Creator (cf. ix, 304).

b) “They have gone so far as to ignore the person of Our Lord Jesus Christ, True God and True Man, as well as the specific character of the liberation which He bestows upon us, which is above all liberation from sin” (x, 7). “It is clear that they deny faith in the Word Incarnate who was put to death and has risen for all men” (x, 11).

c) The origin and hierarchical structure of the Church is not considered to be divine and so the Church is not considered as the universal sacrament of salvation. “They attempt to put in doubt the sacramental and hierarchical structure of the Church as Our Lord willed it. They denounce the hierarchy and the Magisterium as objective representatives of the dominating class which must be



fought. Theologically, this position says once again that the people are the source of the ministries and that they may provide themselves with ministers of their choice, according to the necessities of their historical revolutionary mission" (ix, 13).

d) There is no distinction made by them between the natural and supernatural orders. "They will add that there is no more than one history in which one should not distinguish between the history of salvation and profane history" (ix, 3).

e) "The Eucharist is no longer comprehended in its truth as a sacramental presence of the reconciling sacrifice, and as the gift of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is converted into a celebration of the struggling people" (a, 16; also cf. ix, 1). The songs or so-called hymns composed for such celebrations are designed to foster such an attitude of mind.

f) There is an utter lack of a proper understanding of sin (cf. iv, 2, 12, 14-15).

g) The theological virtues are given a distorted meaning. "Faith, hope and charity receive a new context" they are 'fidelity to history', 'confidence in the future' and 'the option for the poor'— which is, as it were, to deny their theological reality" (ix, 5). In other words, faith is not unconditional adherence to the revealed word of God; hope is based on the Marxist theory of a Utopia resulting from class struggle; and charity is love of the poor and hatred of the rich, which is to be expressed by violent means; as the Instruction says, "they present the undertaking of the class struggle as a requirement of charity as such; they denounce the will to love everyone here and now regardless of his class, and the will to meet him by the non-violent ways of dialogue and persuasion, as a stagnant attitude contrary to the love of the poor" (ix, 7).

h) They maintain that the poor are the authentic *locus theologicus* (object of theological study) for the comprehension of truth and Christian praxis" and that they are the "sacrament of Christ". As the Instruction puts it: "there is no truth except in the combat of the revolutionary class" (viii, 5).

In this way, "the theological criteria of the truth are thus relativized and subordinated to the imperatives of the class struggle. In this perspective, orthodoxy as the right rule of faith is replaced with the idea of ortho-praxis as the criterion of Truth" (x, 3). Pope John Paul II condemned this supplanting of orthodoxy by praxis in *Catechesi Tradendae*; N. 22. It is an error dating back to Immanuel Kant and Karl Marx

For these theologians the whole spiritual program of Christianity is reduced to fighting for the social betterment of the oppressed by violent means, according to the Marxist scientific analyses. "They appear", says Ratzinger, "to relegate liberation from sin to a secondary level" (*Introduction to the Instruction*).

"Frequently, the spiration for justice is found completely taken over by ideologies which hide or pervert its meaning by proposing that the people's struggle for liberation take on purposes opposed to the true end of human life and by preaching ways of action that imply a systematic recourse to violence, all of which are contrary to an ethics that respects persons" (11, 3).

Cardinal Ratzinger perceptively points to the serious danger involved in the above errors: "When a radical revolution of social relations is set up as the *first imperative*, and when, on the same basis, the search for personal perfection is also questioned, one enters into the way of denial of the meaning and transcendence of the person, and destroys ethics and its foundation which is the absolute character of the distinction between good and evil" (iv,15).

The following two quotes from the Vatican Instruction provide a fitting conclusion to our analysis of "liberation theologies": "liberation theologians propose an innovating interpretation of the concept of the Faith and of Christian existence which gravely departs from the Faith of the Church, and even more, constitutes the practical denial of it" (vi, 9). Moreover, these ideologies "tend especially to deny or eliminate the transcendence and gravity of our liberation in Jesus Christ, True God and True Man; the sovereignty of His Grace; the true nature of the means of salvation; and especially, the true nature of the Church and the sacraments".

In the February issue of "Christian Order", Father Paul Crane, S.J., who is also Director of Claver House, published Reports from past students, taken from a Newsletter, which goes out to them all from time to time. This month he publishes in "Christian Order" a Newsletter sent out to approximately 700 past students, which carries on the story. The interest shown by readers in the February batch of Reports has moved him to do so.

#### CURRENT COMMENT

## Claver House : For the Record : 2

PAUL CRANE, S.J.

**D**EAR Past Students and Friends,  
I am late with this Newsletter which should have been in time for Easter, yet here I am writing it almost at the beginning of Holy Week, just about ten days before Easter Sunday itself. For this, please forgive me. I'll try to be more punctual in future, but that is becoming increasingly difficult. The reason is that, these days, there seems to be more to do than ever before. And the reason for this is that, as Claver House gets better and better known, contacts increase and work increases. This is a very good thing because it reflects the appreciation which so many have for Claver House and the work it is doing. Their appreciation flows from their belief in that work. Claver House is succeeding in its purpose, which is to give back to Africa, when they have finished their nine-months course, the kind of men who will give their countries the help which *all* countries, not only those in Africa, need so much today. And that is the help which dedicated laymen, basing their lives on Christian principles, give without thought for themselves. That is what you are doing so well. For this I thank you with all my heart.

You will remember my telling you so often, when you were at Claver House, that the only advertisement I look for, where Claver House is concerned, is you yourselves and the work you do. I want no other. I can tell you all now that I need no other. Claver House is known in Africa because of what you are doing and doing so well. Below, you will find another batch of Reports from past students. Only some : there is just not space to publish all I have. These will follow in a later letter, along with others that you will send me between now and then. Meanwhile, these that follow speak for themselves :

**Batista Nadir (1972-73) :** Continues to work in the Sudan for the Chevron Oil Company, which has had to cease oil exploration in the South Sudan because of the civil—or near civil-war there. But the Company continues to go ahead despite this.

**Elias Mukandara (1973-74) :** Writes from his home in the Bukoba Diocese of Tanzania : “For the past four years I have moved around in my Diocese of Bukoba organising youth seminars. I have also attended international seminars in Madagascar (Malagasy Republic), Rwanda, Zambia, Togo and Cameroon. I have been selected as Co-ordinator (for the Youth Movement) for the English-speaking countries of Africa. I have to organise youth seminars and make contacts with Kenya, Uganda and Malawi. Contacts have already been made in Zimbabwe”. This is good work for which Elias is admirably well suited.

**Joseph Mibei (1974-75) :** Wrote in April, 1985 with the information that his promotion from Location Chief (Sitia Central in Kenya) to District Officer was under consideration by the Authorities.

**Gabriel Savrimuthu (1975-76) :** After his return to Mauritius at the end of the Course, Gabriel was a member of the Administrative Committee of the Catholic-sponsored IDP (Institute for Development and Progress); lectured also from 1977-1982 on Credit Unions for the Institute's Social Leadership Courses.

His main work has been with the MSJM (the Catholic-sponsored Social Movement for Mauritian Working Youth, as it might be translated into English). Gabriel was Director of this Movement from 1977-1981. During this time, he conducted surveys, organized a work-camp for the building



and rebuilding of houses after the destruction and damage brought by cyclones, set up training courses for members of the MSJM and others who attended, ran the MSJM's Technical School, helped the unemployed set themselves up in small farming. Gabriel Savrimuthu was Secretary General of the MSJU from 1982-1983. This meant that he had to do all the office work and, at the same time, represent his Organization at different levels.

In addition, as an employee of the Diocese of Port Louis, Gabriel was responsible for the preparation of something like ten to fifteen adults for Baptism every year. At the end of August, 1984 he started Courses of Religious Instruction to the students of two colleges at Rose Hill. Further, he is giving a lot of time to a new Catholic Group he has founded and that goes by the name of, "The Social Apostolate". The aim of the Group is to keep those engaged in the Social Apostolate in line with the Gospel.

One man's work, magnificently done.

**Camillo Jada Lako (1975-76):** On his return to the South Sudan, Camillo carried on with his teaching and early in 1985 wrote to say that he was now Headmaster of an Intermediate School. He was sent in January, 1985 on a course at the Eldoret Pastoral Institute by the Archbishop of Juba, His Grace Paolino Lukuda.

**Christopher Asava (1976-77):** Continues to live in London with his wife and daughter. After a spell with the B.B.C. World Service at Programme Assistant, whilst doing some broadcasting, Christopher left the Service to try his hand at free-lance writing and authorship. His country is Kenya, where he worked as a parish catechist in Nairobi for seven years before coming to the Claver House Course.

**Martin J. Kamba (1978-79):** Martin holds a good and influential post as Head of the Primary Division at the Starehe Boys Centre and School in Nairobi. His official title is Assistant Director, Primary Division.

**John Baptist Asan (1978-79):** Returning to the South Sudan on the completion of his Claver House Course, John-Baptist took up again his teaching post in the Senior Commercial Secondary School. From there he went to the Linguistics Institute, a project run jointly by the Ministry of Education of the South Sudan and the Summer Institute

of Linguistics. The object of the Institute is literacy in the mother tongue. The Staff does research on the Major Languages of the South, writes Primers and trains teachers to teach from these Primers. John Baptist became a General Administrator on joining the Institute in 1980. From 1981-84 he was a Production Manager. Now he is a Co-ordinator; which means that he is in charge of the activities associated with published materials, from the manuscript stage to publishing and distribution inclusive. He says in his letter that it was the training received at Claver House that enabled him to cope with all the stages of what is a most important work.

**Alain Rose (1979-80) :** After much hard and patient work has now got the Credit Union he founded to the point where it is beginning to be seen as a model for the whole of Mauritius. At the time of writing, in the Summer of 1985, Alain said that his credit union officials were setting up a Research Committee to provide Mauritians with adequate information concerning the Credit Union Movement as a whole.

**John Okello-Atim (1979-80) :** Writes from the North of Uganda, which has been through a very troubled time that the Owee Co-operative Society, which he started in 1980 is still in existence; and that he is working hard to get it registered by the end of this year, 1985.

**George Chisvo (1979-80) :** Having done excellent work as a Youth Officer since his return to Zimbabwe, George is now at the University of Zimbabwe doing a Diploma in Education, which will help him greatly in his future work for his country's youth.

**Lebohlang C. Mohafi (1980-81) :** Began work for a Degree at the National University of Lesotho in August of this year, 1985. He will be reading Politics and Administration.

**James Kiprop Chelanga (1981-82) :** Is working for his Degree at Rajasthan University in India.

**Father Valentine Tsoebeane (1981-82) :** Is at present following a course of studies in Rome at the request of his Bishop, Sebastian Khoarai of Mohale's Hoek in Lesotho, who is himself a past student of Claver House.

**Paul Musonye (1981-82) :** Died on November 23rd, 1984 in Ngong. He worked for the Diocese of Ngong and died

on the way home from his office in the town of that name. Pray, please, for the repose of his soul and for his wife, Antoinine and his eight children, who survive him.

**Gabriel Turay (1981-82)** : Came to Claver House as a capable Catholic teacher in the Diocese of Makeni, in the North of Sierra Leone. At the request of the Diocesan Authorities, he went on to St. Mary's College, Strawberry Hill to work for his Degree in Education. At the time of writing, he has completed this work and returned home, where I have no doubt he will hold a high teaching post and be a great influence for good at his work and, so to say, outside it.

**Gerald Mokhali Nkotoane (1981-82)** : Died tragically in Lesotho a few days before Christmas, 1983 when he was struck by lightning at his duty station as a Field Officer, working for the Ministry of Co-operatives and Development. Pray, please, for the repose of the soul of a fine young man and past student of Claver House.

**Robert Ngila (1982-83)** : Robert was appointed on April 1st, 1984 General Manager of the Kenya Craft Co-operative Union Ltd. The Union has as its affiliates primary craft co-operative societies. These are to be found in Nairobi, Mombasa and Machakos, each with its own Production Manager. Robert, as General Manager of the Union, has his office in Nairobi. At the time he wrote me, the Union had, all told, about 5000 primary-society members. Markets were already opened in the United States and West Germany. Robert was in process of arranging for the opening of new markets in Scandinavia and Britain.

**Albert Kofi Mensah (1982-83)** : Albert wrote that his credit union activities were going well and that he was organising and setting up more credit unions in his region of Ghana, which is that of Cape Coast. He was enstooled as Chief of his Town in the Summer of 1984, the name he assumed on this occasion—his stool name—is Nana Mensah Abrompah II. Meanwhile, the credit union founded by Bartholomew Quainoo, who died so sadly approximately two years ago, has been persuaded by Albert to undertake a pilot project—fifty acres of land have been cleared for the planting of maize and cassava; very soon palm trees will be planted.

**Peter Mitaru Njaibu (1982-83) :** Took up again his teaching job when he returned to Nairobi after the Course at Claver House and was appointed Deputy Head Master, with effect from September, 1983. When he last wrote, he was applying for a post with the Ministry of Culture and Social Services.

**Daniel Maithya (1982-83) :** Received a scholarship and is at present studying for a Degree in Sociology at Emporia State University, Kansas, USA.

**John Shoniwa (1982-83) :** Wrote from Mvurwi, Zimbabwe, where he has long been a teacher—and a very good one—at the Forrester “A” School, that he was in process of helping with the financing necessary for the upkeep of his parish and its priest. On his return from Claver House, John got to work and set up a credit union, which is working very well indeed and whose benefits the people round about are now discovering and enjoying. They are eager savers now and, so far as I gather from John, each one of the members deposits on the average something like 10 Zimbabwean dollars a month. Projects are varied and include, amongst other things, chicken and rabbit-keeping and the building and improvement of houses in the communal lands.

**Bernard Ntoi (1982-83) :** Wrote from Lesotho that he was working in the Marketing Section of the Planning Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture and Planning. He has done extremely well there; so much so that Bernard’s Ministry through United States A.I.D. made arrangements for him to attend a two-months’ Course in Vegetable Crop Production and Marketing in the United States from June 1985 until August 24th of the same year. After this Course, Bernard was to go on to do a Degree in Agricultural Economic, still in the United States. He will do well and deserves to.

There you are then. Reading these Reports I have more reason than ever to be proud of you all; and I *am* proud. It is people who count today; as always, far more than projects. For what on earth is the use of projects without good men to run them? You are those men. God bless you and keep you at it, now and always.

Paul Crane, S.J.



Readers, we think, will be not only fascinated but moved by what the Author calls modestly a birds-eye view of the life of Cardinal Bourne. It is beautifully done.

# Francis Cardinal Bourne

(From the Biography by Ernest Oldmeadow)

R.S.

“ . . . . The last day of 1934 was also the last day of Francis Bourne’s life on this earth. . . . Towards evening, Mgr. George Coote, his companion on so many journeys, bethought him of an aid for the last journey of all. . . .” He read for the dying Cardinal a prayer always loved and often recited by him : the “Jesus Psalter”. “Tired. . .” he murmured : “comforting. . .”

Comforting . . . it is a word that comes to mind when one studies the fine, handsome face in the photograph by Bassano : the strength; the steady intelligent eyes; the very firm mouth; the impression of kindness and humour. It is comforting to recall the line of great Cardinals, spanning the years from 1850 onwards: Wiseman, Manning, Vaughan, of whom Cardinal Bourne was for thirty-one years so worthy a successor. Comforting, too, in these days when it is so very hard to keep in touch with the supernatural, to be allowed to see so clearly the hand of God in the events that gave yet another splendid Cardinal Archbishop to the Catholic Church in England.

His grandfather, “Henry Bourne 1”, who began the family tradition of working for, and with, the Government, being at one time involved in negotiations for the Post Office with the frightening Mohammed Ali, who had made an avenue of British soldiers’ heads, stuck on stakes, was described by his son as “one of the very best men I ever knew”. Francis Bourne resembled him both in character and in features. He did not become a Catholic until he was dying, but his two sons, “Henry Bourne II” and Edward, were received into the Church in 1844, when Henry was only eighteen and Edward seventeen, by Father Holdstock in his “poor little church” in Somerstown, at a time when

it was anything but popular or pleasant to be a Catholic. Newman's conversion was yet to come, and when, in 1848, Henry was assured that Newman was a "miserable convert", he thought that the simplest thing to do was to write and find out just what had made him so miserable. The letter made Newman smile, but he replied courteously and at length . . . the reply includes the much-quoted "I can only say, if it is necessary to say it, that from the moment I became a Catholic, I never have had, through God's grace, a single doubt or misgiving in my mind that I did wrong in becoming one. . ." (When preaching at the opening of the new Church of the Oratory in Birmingham in 1906 "for once, Francis Bourne became what is called 'personal' in the pulpit. He read aloud from the letter from Newman to his father").

Henry Bourne married, in 1852, "a sweet bright young Irish lady" from Dublin. The author devotes a chapter to Ellen Bourne, and it is the portrait of a saint. Orphaned very young, she and her sister Mary were sent to schools in France : for the rest of their lives they spoke French as naturally as English. A globe-trotting uncle took them around Europe, unfortunately on their money, leaving them with a very small income and next to no capital. The marriage was ideal : Francis Bourne describes their home as "holy and happy, Catholic in the fullest sense. My father taught me a great deal about the Mass and Liturgy, in which he was keenly interested. My mother and aunt gave me all my early lessons, so that I could read and write, and even know a little Latin. As they constantly spoke French, my ear was accustomed to this language before I could speak it. I knew a great many priests who came to dine. I was much with my father in his free time, and he used to take me to visit various churches with him".

Henry Bourne III was born in 1856, Francis in 1861. He was baptised at the Redemptorist Church, St. Mary's, Clapham, by Father Robert Coffin (later Bishop Coffin), through whose advice both boys were sent to Ushaw, and who ordained Francis in 1885, thus baptising and ordaining one of his successors to the See of Southwark.

Henry Bourne was a civil servant, conscientious and hard-working, entrusted with exacting negotiations abroad

for the Post Office. He also audited, at the request of the Government, the gigantic P. & O. Ship-owners' accounts : the Company, grateful for his handling of the audit, invited him to witness the opening of the Suez Canal from one of their vessels. From Egypt he brought home a tarboosh for "Frank", and the germ which was, combined with overwork, to kill him. His two sons were at Ushaw, and one cheerless winter's day news came to them that their father was dead. He was only forty-four. The year was 1870, and within four years his son Henry, too, was dead. Francis had lost his father, his brother, his home. From henceforth his mother earned a living as a governess in France, eked out by a slender income from Ireland, and paid, single-handed, for the education of the future Cardinal.

Happy though he was at Ushaw, his health obviously was not standing up to the northern climate. He entered St. Edmunds in Hertfordshire, and "Old Hall was the making, physically and spiritually of Francis Bourne". To the kindly Mgr. Patterson he owed, he said : "The good if not very robust health I still enjoy".

His brother had intended to become a priest, while the high-spirited, brilliant, fun-loving Francis had no such ideas. He meant to take up a secular career. A Retreat in 1877 changed all that. . . Father Stanfield gave it, and he was absolutely certain that Francis was destined for the priesthood, and told him so. Writing in 1917, the Cardinal simply says: "So I put on the cassock". The question arose: "for which diocese — Westminster or Southwark ?" Mgr. Patterson accepted him, with a cautious proviso about his health. "At this point", the author says, "comes a remarkable fact". Cardinal Manning himself drove down to St. Edmunds and tried to secure Francis for Westminster, with no health condition at all. Southwark thereupon accepted him, as it were, "dead or alive". For all that Southwark nearly lost him to the Dominicans : he left St. Edmunds to enter their novitiate, but was soon convinced that he had no vocation. Followed a year at Hammersmith, now no longer a seminary, not particularly happy, but useful experience for his future work. An obvious choice for higher studies in Rome, there was no vacancy for him, so that in 1881 he went to St. Sulpice : "one of the greatest graces of my life". From thence to Louvain, where the future Car-

dinal Mercier, with whom he was to cross swords over the "Malines Conversations", taught Philosophy. His health began to break down; he returned to England where Father Searle and Tunbridge Wells combined to bring him, alive and well, to his ordination in 1885.

As a young priest he was briefly at Sheerness, then in Mortlake : here it is consoling to lesser mortals to learn that he was assailed by the classic temptation that "the life is not hard enough". (It is related of a certain novice similarly tempted that the Novice Master promised to make it much harder for him). He thought of the Salesians. At St. Sulpice he had spoken to St. John Bosco : Bishop Butt wisely allowed him to go to Turin, since the saint was thinking of sending three priests to establish an English province, but that wonderful man had the vision of the saints : he sent him back to England, saying he would, in the secular priesthood, do much for the Salesians. On to Blackheath, where his work at the Orphanage led to his West Grinstead appointment (they had an even larger orphanage, with "an exotic population"). Here young Father Bourne taught Latin to any lad who showed signs of a vocation. West Grinstead, also, was very near the enormous Charterhouse of St. Hugh at Parkminster. Most of the monks were French, as was the Prior, who welcomed this serious young priest who spoke French like his mother-tongue. Don Doreau "took note of the curate's exceptional abilities", and it was during a retreat at Parkminster that Bishop Butt decided to found a Southwark Seminary from small beginnings, and here at hand, said Don Doreau, was just the man, despite his youth, for its first Rector. He was twenty-eight. Bishop Butt had both faith and vision; he supposed rightly that Arundel and Brighton would eventually be a separate diocese, so he ruled out Sussex, and searched through Surrey for a suitable site. He bought sixty acres at Wonersh, appointed an architect, and told Father Bourne to look about him and find somewhere temporary for the "small beginning". He chose Henfield, eleven miles north of Brighton : it was more picturesque than comfortable—in winter one took a bath, with a very meagre supply of hot water and plenty of cold, by the light of a stable lantern placed on the brick floor. But it was much-loved, and happy in its Rector, whom the students idolised. Monks



came over from Parkminster and prayed in their chapel, and they often assisted at the monks' Vespers from their gallery. "Who can say how much the Seminary owed to this union with the Carthusians?"

St. John's Seminary, Womersley, was ready to receive the Henfield students by 1891. It was hard going there; excepting the Summer vacation, the students remained in the Seminary for all the year, "thus enabling Holy Week and other great times and feasts to be observed with dignity". "Only Heaven knows how much good has resulted from this element of Seminary life". But heavy crosses were in store: influenza laid both staff and students low, and prepared the way, in those not over-strong, for the dreaded "consumption", almost always fatal in those days. The Rector pleaded with Our Lady, in vain, to save Father Frederick Kent and Denis Larkin, a brilliant student, beloved of Father Bourne, who was to have joined the teaching staff. Two more priests followed.

In 1895 he accompanied the ailing Bishop Butt to Rome, where Pope Leo XIII showed the greatest interest in his seminary. Within a year, Francis Bourne was raised to the Episcopate, being named Auxiliary to Southwark with right of succession. People who were amazed at his appointment as Rector at the age of twenty-eight, must have been still more amazed when he became a bishop at thirty-four, and Archbishop of Westminster at forty-two.

His mother was of course present at his consecration, being then seventy-two. "Although Ellen Bourne could have truly said that her boy's attainment of a great position was the outcome of her own bitter self-denial, she deliberately effaced herself . . . she went quietly away without speaking to the new Bishop". He was consecrated in 1896; she died in 1900. He himself administered the Last Sacraments, going for this purpose to St. Mary's, Clapham, where he had been baptised, and breaking down on the way back. In the course of his life he had had to endure much, and would have to endure more: opposition, misunderstanding, ingratitude, calumny and even insult, but for three days after his mother's death "his courage so nearly failed him that he did not see how he could go on carrying his heavy burden". He buried her, wearing "the last stock she

made for me . . . and I managed to get through without breaking down”.

Great peace followed, and strength. He took up his work with his usual whole-heartedness and went on to the end. His Pastoral Letters dealt mainly with diocesan progress and “appeals for participation in national campaigns agreed upon by the whole Episcopate”, but he wrote very strongly and with personal feeling on the subject of “unclean” books. In the last year of his life, as Cardinal, he repeated the rebuke to those responsible. If he was called the “Quiet Cardinal”, it was not because he kept quiet when something needed saying, but because he waited, however long, until he was sure of his ground : that being so, he “called a spade a spade”.

In January, 1903, he was in Rome : his mission was to regularise the position of Army Officer Chaplains. As always, he worked in harmony with Government officials : it was said of him in political circles that “You always knew where you were with Bourne”. He ensured that henceforth his chaplains would also “know where they were”, by himself becoming their ecclesiastical superior. This he did at the formal request of both the Holy See and the British Government, and was warmly thanked for it by the Minister of War.

He returned to England in May : 1903 was a momentous year that saw the death of Cardinal Vaughan and Pope Leo XIII, and the election of Pope St. Pius X. On August 24th he was named Archbishop of Westminster. A well-known daily was kind enough to inform its readers, through its Rome Correspondent, that “Liberal Catholics will be deeply grieved”. Pius X received him cordially; there was a long talk about Westminster Cathedral’s music. The Pope told him what sort of music he wanted for the whole Church, revealing a “copious and exact knowledge of the current Plain Chant editions”.

His fortitude amidst the many trials of his life had strengthened him to endure what would seem to be the inevitable accompaniment of all great positions, ill-informed criticism of his actions and constant opposition to his plans. He was a sensitive man, but the pain he felt could never deflect him from the course which, after much thought and prayer, he saw to be right. At Ushaw he had stood up to

boys twice his size; he now proved time and again that he could not be intimidated, nor swayed by considerations that were purely worldly or personal. Nor did he pass on to others what he knew to be a clear duty to do himself. Pressed to adopt certain measures he replied quietly: "I form my own judgments". In the main, his critics were men tainted by "Modernism"; they itched to "democratize" Church government. "Just as the doctrinal Modernists wished to dilute the Creeds, so these other Modernists wished to attenuate episcopal control of ecclesiastical temporalities".

The London Eucharistic Congress held in 1908 was an uplifting and splendid occasion. The Holy See, for the first time in more than three hundred and fifty years, sent a Legate — Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli. A magnificent procession of the Blessed Sacrament was planned, in thanksgiving, the Archbishop (he was not created a Cardinal until 1911) said, for the gift of Faith and the freedom to practice our holy Religion, bought at such a price by the martyred priests and martyred and persecuted laity of penal days. Such processions had been held in the East End, and the London Police had no fear that order would be disturbed. The Archbishop had worked out a route through quiet streets which were almost deserted on Sunday afternoons, and the mere presence of an enormous crowd (75,000 were expected; nearer 100,000 came), would prevent any trouble from the "lunatic fringe", disowned as they were by the great majority of sincere Protestants. The delightful "Kensit-ites", however, threatened an organised rush on the Cardinal Legate, who would be carrying the Blessed Sacrament under the canopy. Their brazen voices prevailed, coupled by the unearthing of an ancient statue, now observed by nobody. The Prime Minister of the day, at the eleventh hour, thought fit to ban the procession, placing the Archbishop in an impossible position. He exchanged exquisitely polite telegrams with the Prime Minister, and got nowhere: he then faced, with his usual courage, an enormous meeting of Catholics in the Albert Hall. In his small, clear voice, without the aid of the "indispensable" microphone, he controlled a vast and potentially angry audience. He told them there would be no procession of the Blessed Sacrament: instead the Card-

inal Legate, Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, priests, Societies, would process along the planned route, and Benediction would be given from the balcony of the Cathedral. The Prime Minister had intimated that he did not want his name mentioned, but the Archbishop had made it plain that he intended to place the blame where it belonged, and this he did. He thanked the Metropolitan Police for their kindness and courtesy, and repeated their assurance to him that no rioting had been feared.

This brave taking of the bull by the horns evidently appealed to the Press; they supported the Archbishop rather than the Prime Minister. Francis Bourne must have been greatly consoled by a letter from Cardinal Merry del Val, who said: "It was of course a great disappointment to have to give up the Procession of the Blessed Sacrament, and we have also felt it here; but you have known how to turn that disappointment to good account, and you have strengthened the position of the Church in England. The whole Congress has been an immense and remarkable success, and under God it is chiefly due to your efforts and ability".

A birds-eye view of such a long and eventful reign must, of necessity, leave much unsaid. Cardinal Bourne, like his grandfather and father before him, was entrusted with many important and confidential missions by the Government. During the Great War "he laboured without stint for the bodily as well as the spiritual welfare of the soldiers and sailors and their dependants". He answered attacks on Pope Benedict XV, who was being called the "French Pope" by the Germans, and "Pro-German" by the Allies. He was called "unchristian" for upholding those for whom bitter self-sacrifice was made bearable by the belief that theirs was a just war, and that reparation must be made, but he stuck to his guns. After the Armistice in 1918 he warned that there was danger of further conflicts unless problems were justly settled.

Perhaps his finest hour was his leadership of English Catholics during the General Strike of 1926. It began with the miners' strike on April 29th, and the Cardinal got up in the pulpit of Westminster Cathedral on Sunday May 9th and stated in forthright language that "there was no normal justification for a strike of this character . . . all are bound



to uphold and assist the Government". These words "shook the nation"; when things became normal they brought the Cardinal a "fan mail". He was not blind, however, to the "grievous economic difficulties of the miners" and in giving thanks to God he insisted on redress. The Strike, in the event, fizzled out, the faceless men behind it having overlooked the fact that the English, on the whole, enjoy adversity, and are never happier than when they have their backs to the wall, but the Cardinal's intervention will remain part of the history of the Catholic Church in England.

The year 1926 also saw the end of the now almost-forgotten "Malines Conversations". Their object was the resurrection of the hope of "Corporate Reunion". The return of England to the one true fold had been very dear to the heart of Pope Leo XIII, and it was only after the most thorough and impartial investigations that he had issued *Apostolicae Curae* in 1896, a document that was received with satisfaction by all parties as the final word on "Anglican Orders": Rome had declared them "null and void". Pope Leo had forbidden the restless Abbé Portal, whose chance meeting with Lord Halifax had involved so many eminent personages in what might fairly be called a "wild goose chase", to raise the subject again. The Abbé, however, kept in touch behind the scenes with his friends in high places, but he knew better than to encounter the formidable Cardinal Merry del Val, now Secretary of State to Pope St. Pius X, who had been present at all the meetings preceding the Bull, and whose Cause for Canonisation would be later introduced by Pope Pius XII. The Cardinal having ceased to be Secretary of State on the death of Pope Pius X, the Abbé resurfaced after the 1914-1918 War, and decided, with Lord Halifax, to make a fresh attempt. Just as he had deliberately avoided contact with Cardinal Vaughan, now he persuaded his friends that Cardinal Bourne would take an unsympathetic view of "Reunion". The plain truth is, of course, that had either prelate been consulted, the whole thing would have been dropped, as both were very well-informed indeed, and knew that "conversion" was a matter for the individual conscience: indeed the Archbishop of Canterbury had been "deeply

annoyed" when Lord Halifax called with the Abbé Portal, and had made no effort to conceal his feelings.

Lord Halifax and the Abbé turned to Cardinal Mercier, under whose protection the dry bones began once again to rattle. We shall never know why, even if only considered as a matter of courtesy, he did not tell Cardinal Bourne what was going on. This treatment at last drew a very stiff letter from the Cardinal, who complained justly that he "had been treated as though he did not exist". The talks went on for years; a spate of misleading publications appeared, countered by Mgr. Myers, who thoughtfully placed "threescore solid books (such as the lives of Ullathorne, Newman, Wiseman and Vaughan, as well as Ward's works) in the Institut Catholique in Paris. Perhaps Archbishop Randall Davidson should have the last word. He had not disapproved of the Conversations; in fact he had been accused of "betraying his sacred charge" when it became known that members of his flock had been conversing with Roman Catholics "under the roof of a Roman Catholic Cardinal in Belgium", but he brought those concerned back to reality when he wrote: "Is there, or is there not, a Vicar of Christ upon earth, who possesses *jure divino* a distinctive authoritative position in relation to the whole of Christendom ? . . ."

Cardinal Bourne did much to revive pilgrimages to Walsingham on a national scale, and almost his last public appearance was at the 1934 pilgrimage. He was too ill to walk in the procession to the place of Benediction, but Mgr. Coote "skilfully piloted him by car down a narrow lane and up a rough slope of tussocky grass". He had had a deep devotion to Our Lady all his life, and had turned to her in every need. This was August, and on the last day of the year, he laid his burden down at her feet. "Tired. . ." he said. He is buried in Pugin's chapel, at the foot of the altar, in St. Edmund's College, Ware; his heart is in Wondersh.

### DURING PAST MONTHS

the flow of renewals and, indeed, of new subscriptions has been such that it has proved impossible for me to write and thank personally all those who have renewed their subscriptions with such generosity. I feel sure you will excuse me and understand if I take this opportunity of thanking publicly all those who have been so kind and so very generous in their support. Without it, I do not really know where I should be! Thank you all more than I can say.

—*Paul Crane, S.J.*



## **TO READERS FROM NORTH OF THE BORDER :**

**Do you live in Scotland  
and long for the restoration of the  
Old Mass ?**

**If so, this vitally concerns you :**

The Papal Indult of October 1984 officially recognises your right to the traditional Catholic (Tridentine) Mass, but its implementation has been entrusted to the diocesan Bishops. It is not, however, sufficient to write individually to your own Bishop requesting his permission; for he will not allow regular celebrations except for members of an organised group. In Scotland that means UNA VOCE, your own branch of the International Federation, which corresponds to the Latin Mass Society in England and Wales.

**In order to back up our requests, new members  
are urgently required in every Scottish Diocese.**

Those wishing to join should get in touch immediately with:

**The Hon. Secretary,  
UNA VOCE (Scotland),  
6 Belford Park,  
Edinburgh EH4 3DT.**